

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1886.

The Week.

THE votes taken in the Senate on the Morrison surplus resolution as amended by the Finance Committee, and on the various amendments offered by individual Senators, do not furnish much text for political discourse. In a broad way it may be said that if the Senate had been under Democratic control, the resolution would probably have passed as it came from the House, although this is not certain, the Democratic members having divided equally, 14 to 14, on the test vote. Twenty-three Republican Senators voted for the Finance Committee's amendment and 13 against it. The aggregate vote, 37 to 27, in favor of the amendment, is a very gratifying result, showing that no very bad financial measure can be carried through Congress until the composition of the Senate is very much changed. Perhaps the most gratifying exhibit is that made by the Southern Democratic Senators, twelve of whom voted for the amendment. While it is true that twelve Senators from the late slaveholding States voted the other way, the expectation was that there would be a considerable majority in favor of "cheap money." The debate at its close exposed the true character of the resolution. Everybody understood that it was a last desperate effort to force the silver standard on the country. The Senate has put upon this attempt a negative of so decided a character that Mr. Bland and his party in the House may well consider the question, whether they are likely to live long enough to see the silver standard established solely by the operation of the two-millions-per-month law.

Each party gave a slight majority in favor of the extraordinary amendment to the surplus resolution proposing that the Government pay 100 cents apiece for the 75-cent trade dollars; the Republicans standing 19 to 16 and the Democrats 15 to 13. Mr. Evarts voted with the majority. At the present price of silver the trade dollar is worth only 75 cents. It is not legal tender. It is an ingot manufactured expressly and exclusively for sale to the Chinese. It never had any circulation in this country until the price of silver fell so that 420 grains of it were worth less than 25 8-10 grains of gold. Then speculators began to buy them up in China and reimport them to the United States, and palm them off as the equivalent of gold. They had a brief and fitful circulation until business men refused to receive them. Then speculators bought them up a second time, and have been holding them, together with the stock that they were unable to get rid of, and besieging Congress to take them at par as the equivalent of gold dollars. The importation from China naturally ceased when the business community threw them out, but it will spring up with amazing rapidity as soon as it is learned that 75 cents' worth of them will bring a dollar at the United States Treasury. It is

simply amazing that such a measure could have passed, except in the way of burlesque, in order to put a fool's cap on the Morrison resolution.

The President's message approving the Oleomargarine Bill is an unusual but not an unprecedented proceeding. President Lincoln, we believe, set the example of stating his reasons for signing a bill which he did not altogether approve of, and the example was followed, if we recollect rightly, by President Johnson. The Constitution contains no warrant for such a method of procedure. At the same time it does not prohibit it. It must be held allowable because there are no means to prevent it, but it would be more consonant with the spirit of the instrument if the President would simply approve or disapprove the measures before him, and state his opinions regarding legislation in his annual messages to Congress. The reasons given by him for signing the bill will not be satisfactory to those who, like ourselves, consider it a very plain case of class legislation, and the most offensive specimen of its kind to be found on the statute-book. That this is its true character in the President's estimation is made plain by the following paragraph in his message:

"If this article has the merit which its friends claim for it, and if the people of the land, with full knowledge of its real character, desire to purchase and use it, the taxes exacted by this bill will permit a fair profit to both manufacturer and seller. If the existence of the commodity taxed and the profits of its manufacture and sale depend upon disposing of it to the people for something else which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry; and if it cannot endure the exhibition of its real character which will be effected by the inspection, supervision, and stamping which this bill directs, the sooner it is destroyed the better in the interest of fair dealing. Such a result would not furnish the first instance in the history of legislation in which a revenue bill produced a benefit which was merely incidental to its main purpose. There is certainly no industry better entitled to the incidental advantages which may follow this legislation than our farming and dairy interests, and to none of our people should they be less begrudged than our farmers and dairymen."

Obviously the "revenue measure" which gains more or less support from the fact that it gives incidental advantages to a worthy class of people, is a crooked measure, a dangerous measure, and a blot upon the spirit of modern legislation. Although it bears striking likeness to the principles of the protective tariff, it differs from the latter in lacking the element of supposed patriotism, which constitutes the largest part of the sophistries underlying that system. It is a plain, unvarnished game of grab, taking from A to give to B, because B is an industrious man with a large family, and has a hard time to make a living.

The President makes the suggestion that the second section of the bill leaves some doubt whether the article oleomargarine is taxable unless it is made "in imitation or semblance of butter, or, when so made, calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter." There can be no doubt that the intention of the framers of the bill was to tax oleomargarine even if it were made as black as tar. There can be little doubt that when the bill comes before the

courts the latter will try to find some way of construing it so that it shall be conformable to justice and liberty. The bill certainly leaves a wide door open for construction. The first section defines the article butter and the second defines the article oleomargarine. The definition of the latter ends with the words quoted. Would a court impose a fine upon a man who made or sold untaxed oleomargarine not in imitation or semblance of butter, and not calculated or intended to be sold as butter? Probably not. How much "semblance" of butter will serve to warrant the imprisonment of an American citizen in the latter part of the nineteenth century? What facts shall be relied on to show that an article which is not butter is "calculated" to be sold for butter? These questions will certainly come up for adjudication. They present a fruitful vista for lawyers.

The President sent in two vetoes on Friday. One was of a bill proposing to erect an expensive public building in the little city of Springfield, Mo., where the only quarters required by the Federal Government are for the employees of the Land Office, now accommodated at a rent of \$300 a year, and the half-dozen employees of the post-office, now housed in rooms furnished the Government free of expense. The average taxpayer is sure to endorse the President's conclusion: "Upon the facts presented, I am satisfied that the business of the Government at this point can be well transacted for the present without the construction of the proposed building." The other veto was of an act to authorize the construction of a railway bridge across that part of the waters of Lake Champlain lying between the towns of North Hero and Alburgh, in the State of Vermont, regarding which the President says:

"On the 10th day of June, 1884, a bill was approved and became a law, having the same title and containing precisely the same provisions and in the exact words of the bill herewith returned. The records of the War Department indicate that nothing has been done toward building the bridge permitted by such prior act; it is hardly possible that the bill now before me is intended to authorize an additional bridge between the two towns named, and I have been unable to discover any excuse or necessity for new legislation on the subject."

The President's latest pension veto furnishes a most glaring illustration of the recklessness with which this sort of legislation is enacted. The act proposed to grant a pension to Mrs. Jennette Dow, on the ground that her husband's death from apoplexy on the 17th of December, 1882, was due to a gun-shot wound in his left knee received in September, 1863. It appears that Mr. Dow served for years after the war as a railroad conductor; that there was no medical testimony which attributed death to the wound, "and it would be hardly credible," Mr. Cleveland remarks, "if such evidence was found"; and that the widow's claim was rejected by the Pension Bureau last year upon the ground that her husband's death was not caused by the wound. "I am sure," says the President in conclusion, "that in no case, except in an application for pension, would an attempt be made in the circumstances

here developed to attribute death from apoplexy to a wound in the knee received nineteen years before the apoplectic attack." If Republican stump-speakers want to go before the country on the platform of condemning a Democratic President for blocking such claims as this, the Democrats ought to consider themselves very lucky.

Mr. Evarts's speech on the silver question has resolved all doubts regarding his position, and must be gratifying to the business men of the country. His idea is that the President should correspond with European governments between the present time and the reassembling of Congress, in order to find out what their views are in reference to international bi-metallism. Then, when Congress does reassemble, we shall know where we stand, and "if satisfied that there is no reliable determination in that regard, Congress can take up and debate and settle the whole basis of currency and coinage." This is so rational and hopeful that we wonder still more why Mr. Evarts held us so long in suspense.

It is not easy to get at the real opinions of Mr. T. V. Powderly on the various points in the "labor problem," for they seem to vary from day to day. But he has at all events made it quite clear that he is by no means the "moral suasion" apostle which some of his friends tried to persuade us he was last April. He talks like one now and then, but just as often talks like a striker and a boycotter. The other day he denounced the militia for "standing between the laborer and his rights," although the only interference with the laborer of which the militia has ever been guilty has consisted in preventing him from smashing other people's property, and hitting people for entering into lawful contracts. Mr. Powderly does, however, seem to approve cordially of the boycott. He has written to Mr. James Redpath, denying that he "opposes it altogether." He says "he regards it as too good a tool to be dulled by botch workmen; it should be used only where actually necessary, and then effectually." The phrase "actually necessary," of course, means that it should be used only when the laborers have failed in persuading an employer to hire them against his will on their own terms. Powderly would then, but only then, employ intimidation and violence against him—that is, threaten him with the ruin of his business if he did not submit; and he would not threaten him unless the boycotting arrangements were so perfect that he would be sure to accomplish it. The truth is, that behind all the philanthropic preambles and constitutions of the Knights of Labor there lies the fixed determination to use violence to gain their ends whenever they think it can be done with impunity, or, as Mr. Powderly calls it, "effectually." But every such utterance, we think, increases the determination of all good citizens that neither Mr. Powderly nor any of his followers shall be permitted to be "effectual" on American soil. If they want to revel in boycotting, they must start for some still unsettled region, and boycott each other.

The struggle between the Knights of Labor

and the two other organizations, known as the International and the Progressive Cigarmakers' Unions, for the control of the cigar manufactories of the country is a very interesting one. At present the manufacturers appear to adhere firmly to the Knights, and declare their willingness to have their shops continue, in the control of that organization; but the other two unions are so firmly united, and control so large a number of cigarmakers, that the Knights are experiencing great trouble in filling the shops with men. Of course the contest derives its chief public interest from being a struggle of one body of laborers with another. The employers are not directly interested except as they take sides with one party or the other. There is no attack upon capital involved, but simply a question of whether one union or the other two combined in one shall control. The men who are locked out are not strikers, but are refused work because they decline the authority of one union in order to submit to that of another.

"The increase in the production of iron and steel in the United States," said the *Tribune* recently, "is an encouraging indication of returning business prosperity. The production of pig-iron in the first half of this year amounted to 2,954,209 tons, which is considerably more than was ever before produced in the same length of time. According to the official report of the Iron and Steel Association, more steel also will be produced in 1886 than in any previous year." If Mr. Blaine had been elected President in 1884, the *Tribune* would have attributed this unprecedented showing to the influence of his "brilliant" administration. It is hardly to be expected that it should ascribe any of the credit as the case stands to Mr. Cleveland, but even the *Tribune* will find it hard to convince its readers that the country is going to ruin under a Democratic President, when it is called upon to print such facts as these.

The nation has a special cause for thanksgiving this year. For the first time there will be no "October election" in Ohio. Last year the voters ratified a constitutional amendment changing the time for the annual State election from October to November, and hereafter the country will be free from the demoralizing performances so often enacted in the past in order to secure the "moral effect" of a party victory for use in other States which voted later. Indiana made the same change earlier than Ohio, and Maine would have changed from September to November before now if Mr. Blaine had not wanted to save the chance for getting up a boom by fixing public attention upon an early campaign in his State. But the September election in Maine is of little consequence, and the November contests in the country at large will hereafter be hardly at all affected by earlier elections in the very few States which still cling to the folly of voting for State officers in the summer or early fall.

The post-office at Gloucester, Mass., employs a number of clerks to receive and distribute mail matter, to attend to money orders, etc., and a number of carriers to deliver letters, postal cards, and papers throughout the city and

bring back the contents of the street letter-boxes. These various employments have no more connection with national politics than have the employments of men engaged in receiving and sending telegraphic despatches or express matter for one or another of the corporations engaged in those lines of communication. A few months ago a Democrat was appointed postmaster, and, upon assuming charge, he investigated the condition of the office precisely as a man would do who should take charge of a telegraph office or an express office provided with a full force of employees—that is to say, he set out to discover whether they were capable and efficient workmen, knowing that, if they were so, their experience would make them more valuable to their employer than green hands could be. He found that his predecessor had left the office well organized, and he determined to retain the force of subordinates which he found, exactly as any sensible superintendent of a telegraph or express office would have done under similar circumstances. When the Democratic managers came around and insisted that he should discharge these old employees simply to make room for a lot of new men who needed to be "taken care of," he refused to comply, and told them the simple truth, that the business of the Government could not be conducted with equal despatch if he should turn it over to a set of men who knew nothing about it. For this sensible application of business principles the Postmaster has been formally "arraigned" by the Democratic City Committee, who have adopted resolutions declaring their belief that it is "for the best interest and prosperity of the party"—not, it will be observed, of the people of both parties who are taxed to support the post office—"that immediate changes should be made in the Post-office Department in this city"; and that "no branch in any department of the Government can be carried on systematically and with efficiency while men holding positions are antagonistic to the Administration." They ask for the present postmaster's removal because he believes in retaining as clerks and carriers efficient men who are not Democrats. No "mere theorist" could possibly expose the utterly ridiculous character of the spoils system of administering the Government so forcibly as these "practical politicians" have done by thus formulating it.

A compilation of the Vermont school statistics for the year ending March 31, 1886, furnishes an interesting basis for comparison with the Southern State which most resembles Vermont in the character of its territory and population. The last census showed that there were in Vermont 99,463 children between the ages of five and twenty years, while the whole number of children enrolled in the public schools last year was 71,667, or 72 per cent., and the average daily attendance of those enrolled was 46,625, or 65 per cent. In West Virginia there are 228,185 children of the school age, of whom the last report showed 166,272 enrolled, or 73 per cent., and the average daily attendance 102,012, or 61 per cent. It will thus be seen that the proportion of all children in West Virginia who attend a public school at some time

during the year already slightly exceeds the proportion in Vermont, while the ratio of average attendance is nearly as large in the Southern as in the Northern State. The school year is still decidedly longer in Vermont, the average number of days being 136, against 100 in West Virginia; but the latter State is steadily lengthening the school year, and the last report of the School Superintendent advocates as entirely feasible a legal provision that the minimum term shall be fixed at six months, whereas in Vermont, the Superintendent states, "the session in many districts is limited to twenty weeks." The absurdity of the Blair bill is fully perceived only when one makes such a comparison as this, and then reflects that that scheme proposed to tax the people of Vermont for the benefit of a State which already makes nearly as good a showing as itself, and is steadily improving its educational system.

The *Tribune* on Thursday revealed "a case of suffering and distress," as "deserving of immediate attention from charitably disposed people." It is the case of a young dry-goods salesman and his family of four children, who are in want of the necessities of life and in danger of eviction for non-payment of rent. "The young man," it says, "is known in business and political circles, and his name is withheld out of regard for his feelings." It then adds:

"His troubles date from the last Presidential campaign. He worked zealously for Mr. Blaine's election, organized clubs, and, like many other enthusiastic Republicans, bet heavily on the result. He lost \$2,000 and this crippled him for a time. But he was getting over this all right when he lost his place, and that, together with sickness in his family, has driven him almost to desperation. A position is open for him in Philadelphia, but one of his creditors, to whom he owes \$42, threatens to put him in jail if he attempts to leave the city."

This young man is, however, by no means the only Blaineite in this city whose "troubles date from the last Presidential campaign." There are scores of them who have never been able to get their heads above water since they "worked" for Blaine and betted on his election in 1884. They were led into their troubles by the extraordinary confidence of the charlatans who had charge of the Blaine canvass in this city, and thought they had made his election sure by the arrangement between Jay Gould and Johnny O'Brien and Tammany. We think the editor of the *Tribune* is himself bound in morals to take charge of this young man and his four children, for the present at all events, for he is one of the principal authors of his woe.

Lord Hartington, as well as Chamberlain and Sir Henry James, have, it is said, promised Lord Salisbury their support in maintaining "the integrity of the Empire," and he is reported to find some comfort in this; but why, it is hard to see. As parties now stand in Parliament, no assaults on the integrity of the Empire can possibly come from anybody but the Ministry, so that the promise is really a promise to stand by the Ministry in *not* doing something—probably the oddest pledge ever offered in politics. It is as if Lord Hartington were to say: "I promise you my support and that of my colleagues in not attempting to alter the existing legislative union between

Great Britain and Ireland." A promise of this kind is, however, of no value to a Ministry. What it needs is support in what it does, and not in what it does not do. As matters stand, when it moves in any direction it will move in complete ignorance of what the Unionists will say. The course of the new Ministry towards the Irish is not yet shadowed forth. But they will probably shrink from coercion as long as possible; and get up some scheme of local government, "the autonomy of gas and sewage," as John Morley called it. The difficulty of making the Irish accept this as anything but an instalment of their claim, will probably soon begin to be seen. Either the Irish will not accept such a scheme at all, and will go to work to insure its failure if carried out, or they will accept it and then use the bodies it creates as aids in the agitation for home rule. The latter is the more probable supposition. With twenty-eight county boards in their hands, possessing considerable powers of taxation, and the right to meet and debate, the National Leaguers would be more powerful than ever. To silence them, the boards would have to be suppressed or the members put in jail. But then, suppression and imprisonment are temporary processes. They would soon have to come to an end, and then the old work of "pacifying Ireland" would have to begin over again.

Judging from an abstract of the speech from the throne with which King Milan of Servia on July 19 opened the newly elected Skupshchina, he has learned little wisdom from his disgraceful defeat in the late conflict with Bulgaria. He not only declares that in taking up arms he merely accepted, in accordance with the national desire, the state of open hostility created by the Bulgarian Government, but expresses his determination further to obey the popular will by jealously watching the equilibrium of the Balkan States, and protesting against any one-sided infringement of it. If this means anything, it means that in case either Bulgaria or Montenegro should attempt a further extension of her boundaries, or the former proclaim her perfect independence of Turkish dominion, he would again be ready to plunge his people into a fratricidal war and a deeper abyss of misery and public debt. That he meditates no such rashness in case Austria-Hungary proclaims the final annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is clear, for on the protection of that powerful neighbor he relies for his dynastic safety against the machinations of the partisans of the exiled house of the Karageorgevitches, the revolutionary leanings of a large portion of his subjects, and the secret hostility of Russia. The foolish utterance we cite is, in fact, a new bid for the good will of the Austro-Hungarian Government, which, unfortunately for Milan, is now very anxious to show itself friendly to Alexander of Bulgaria, since he has made himself so obnoxious to the Czar of Russia.

The result of the Congressional elections in Mexico, announced as showing a large majority for the Administration, was to have been expected under the present political conditions of that country. Whether so designed or not,

the electoral machinery of Mexico is admirably adapted to the work of suppressing rather than expressing the will of the people. All voting is indirect. The votes of the people simply elect electors, who then fill the offices with persons agreeable to themselves; successful candidates before these electoral boards never having been mentioned, often, at the time of general voting. Thus the public voting in the last election took place on the last Sunday in June; but, at that time, no candidates for Congress were mentioned. When the boards of electors, then chosen, proceeded to the choice of Congressmen two weeks later, it must have happened in many cases that representatives were chosen for districts where they were practically unknown. All the advantage of a personal canvass, with the possibility of direct and intelligent voting, is in this way destroyed. It is obvious, too, that the work of the political manipulator is made far easier in the case of such an intermediary electoral body than when he has to deal with the voters of the country as a whole.

All the traditional methods of a political contest in Mexico are also such as to make the overthrow of a Government in a peaceful manner exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Public political discussion is unknown. Attacks, however guarded and impersonal, on the policy of the Administration, can be made only under danger of arrest for disturbing the public peace. Revolution used to be the remedy most resorted to. That being now out of the question, with the aid furnished the Federal authorities by a large standing army, by telegraphic communication, and by railroads facilitating the rapid massing of troops at distant points, the only resource left to the Opposition is intrigue. It should be added, as giving another reason for the triumph of the Administration, that for the past year the most stringent measures have been adopted for the suppression of all public agitation against the policy of the Government. Obsolete laws of doubtful constitutionality, impairing the liberty of the press, have been revived and enforced to the letter. The right of public assembly has been practically denied. Since the 6th of July of last year no less than forty-four editors and students have been imprisoned in the City of Mexico alone, charged with no other offence than that of publicly dissenting from the policy of the Administration. A rigid censorship is maintained over the press, extending not merely to editorial comments, but also to matters of news. For example, the capital was flooded, a few days ago, with copies of the pronunciamiento of Gen. Negrete. It was a harmless document, as Negrete is known to be a man of chronic grievances, feeling that his country has not been duly grateful to him for the part he bore in the famous fifth of May battle of Puebla. But the *Diario Oficial* promptly came out with the warning that any paper so much as publishing the pronunciamiento would be prosecuted. We shall have to wait until the assembling of Congress in September to see how much is left of the small but determined Opposition, which for two years past has, with so great popular approval, assailed the favorite measures of President Diaz.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, July 28, to TUESDAY, August 3, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE President on Thursday transmitted to the Senate, in compliance with a resolution offered by Senator Ingalls, statements from the heads of the executive departments relating to the changes in the classified service during certain periods. Summarized they make the following showing: The number of clerks now embraced within the provisions of the Civil Service Act removed from July 16, 1883, to March 4, 1885—Department of State none, Treasury Department 20, Department of the Interior 28, Department of Justice none, Post-office Department 6, War Department 29, Navy Department 1. Number of appointments during the same period (not including those excepted from examination by rule 19, Civil Service Rules): State 4, Treasury 159, Interior 204, Justice 5, Post-office 41, War 82, Navy 10.

President Cleveland on Friday vetoed the bill providing for a bridge across Lake Champlain between the towns of North Hero and Alburg, Vt., because there is a law already in existence providing for this bridge; and the bill for the erection of a public building at Springfield, Mo., saying: "No Federal courts are held at this place, and apparently the only quarters which the Government should provide are such as are necessary for the accommodation of the post-office and land-office situated there. The Postmaster reports that six employees are engaged in his office. The rooms used as a post-office are now furnished the Government free of expense, and the rent paid for the quarters occupied as a land-office amounts to \$300 annually."

President Cleveland on Monday signed the Oleomargarine Bill, and accompanied it with a long letter in which he said: "This, upon its face and in its main features, is a revenue bill, and was first introduced in the House of Representatives, where the Constitution declares that all bills for raising revenue shall originate. The Constitution has invested Congress with a very wide legislative discretion, both as to the necessity of taxation and the selection of the objects of its burdens. And though, if the question was presented to me as an original proposition, I might doubt the present need of increased taxation, I deem it my duty in this instance to defer to the judgment of the legislative branch of the Government, which has been so emphatically announced in both houses of Congress upon the passage of this bill." He also specially points out that he does not view the bill as class or protective legislation, but as incidentally a defence to the consumer against the sale of imitation for genuine butter.

The President sent the following nominations to the Senate on Wednesday: Alvey A. Ade of the District of Columbia, now Third Assistant Secretary of State, to be Second Assistant Secretary of State, vice William Hunter, deceased; John B. Moore of Delaware to be Third Assistant Secretary of State; E. Spencer Pratt of Alabama to be Minister Resident and Consul General of the United States to Persia. On Thursday he nominated George A. Jenks of Pennsylvania to be Solicitor-General, to succeed Mr. Goode. Mr. Jenks was recently Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The nomination is highly commended.

The Senate on Wednesday passed the Fortifications Bill. As the bill came from the House it appropriated \$620,000, although the estimates of the Department were about \$3,000,000. The amount added in the Senate was \$6,010,000, so that it now appropriates \$6,630,000.

At the close of the debate on the Morrison Surplus Resolution on Friday it was passed by the Senate—yeas 42, nays 20—as follows (Democrats in italics): Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Blair, Brown, Call, Camden, Cameron,

Chase, Conger, Cullom, Dawes, Dolph, Edmunds, Evarts, Frye, *Gibson, Gorman, Gray, Hale, Hampton, Harrison, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Kenna, McMillan, McPherson, Mahone, Miller, Palmer, Payne, Platt, Pugh, Riddleberger, Sabin, Sawyer, Sewell, Sherman, Spooner, Van Wyck, Walthal and Wilson* of Maryland—42. Nays—Messrs. Beck, Berry, Blackburn, Butler, Cockrell, Coke, Eustis, Harris, Ingalls, Jones of Arkansas, Maxey, Mitchell of Oregon, Plumb, Stanford, Teller, Vance, Vest, Voorhees, Whithorne, and Wilson of Iowa—20.

The joint resolution as passed is as follows: "Resolved, That whenever the surplus or balance in the Treasury, including the amount held for redemption of United States notes, shall exceed the sum of \$100,000,000, it shall be and is hereby made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to apply such excess, in sums not less than \$10,000,000 per month, during the existence of any such surplus or excess, to the payment of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States payable at the option of the Government. The surplus or balance herein referred to shall be the available surplus, ascertained according to the form of statement of the United States Treasurer, of the assets and liabilities of the Treasury of the United States employed on June 30, 1886; provided that no call shall be made under the provisions of this resolution until a sum equal to the call is in the Treasury over and above the reserve herein mentioned, and provided, further, that the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion may have in the Treasury, over and above the foregoing sums, a working balance not exceeding \$20,000,000; and whenever in the case of any extraordinary emergency, and when, because thereof, in the opinion of the President, the public interests shall require it, he may, by written order, direct the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend further call for the payment of such indebtedness for such period of time as shall be necessary to maintain the public credit unimpaired; and that such suspension and the reasons therefor shall be reported to Congress within ten days after its next meeting, or immediately, if Congress shall be in session." The resolution as it passed the Senate also contained a provision for the redemption of trade dollars at their face value, which was, however, struck out in conference with the House Committee, who have agreed to the other Senate amendments.

The House on Friday resumed consideration of the vetoed pension bills, the first being that one granting \$50 a month to the widow of Gen. David R. Hunter. In advocating the passage of the bill over the President's veto, Mr. Butterworth (Rep., O.) cited the various precedents where the widows of general officers were granted \$50 a month, and he protested against the House making fish of one and flesh of another. The trouble in this case, he thought, was that Gen. Hunter had presided at the Fitz John Porter court-martial. If it were not for that, the President would have signed the bill. The House refused to pass the bill over the veto—yeas 111, nays 108—not the constitutional two-thirds in the affirmative. Others of the vetoed bills were put over till next session. The House on that day rejected the Senate Inter-State Commerce Bill offered as a substitute, and the bill brought forward by Mr. Baker of New York, and passed the House bill by a vote of 133 to 104.

On Saturday the House, by a vote of 102 yeas to 135 nays, refused to agree to the conference report upon the River and Harbor Bill. This is the final defeat of the bill unless the Senate shall recede from its amendments by which the Hennepin and Michigan Canals were put in the bill.

The House on Saturday passed, 209 to 6, the Alien Landlord Bill. On Monday the House concurred in the Senate amendments to the Naval Establishment Bill. It now goes to the President.

Congress on Monday and Tuesday rapidly hastened business with a view to adjournment at four p. m. on August 4. The House passed the Senate bill increasing the pension of soldiers who have lost an arm or leg in the service. The conference committees reached agreement on the Deficiency Bill (appropriating \$6,850,000) and the Sundry Civil Bill. They disagreed, however, on the Northern Pacific Forfeiture and Timber Culture Bills, and they were abandoned. An incident of Tuesday was a partisan harangue by Senator Hoar, which called forth vigorous replies from Southern Senators.

Gov. Ireland of Texas received on Friday a report from the American Consul at Piedras Negras, Mexico, of the unlawful arrest at Eagle Pass, Texas, of Francisco Arresures, on a trumped-up charge of horse-stealing, his immediate delivery to the Mexican authorities, and his summary execution by them. The Consul says: "A protest against being delivered to the Mexican officers was strongly made by Arresures, who insisted that he should be killed by Mondragon (Captain of the State Rangers in Coahuila), his personal enemy. He appealed to me for protection on the morning of July 27, and I at once demanded his return to Texas on the ground of his being kidnapped, and also had Sheriff Oglesby to demand the prisoner's return on the same ground. Both demands were refused by Mondragon. At one o'clock at night Arresures was taken from jail and brutally murdered by three of Mondragon's troops. In 1873 Arresures made declaration of citizenship in Maverick County. He lived with his family in Eagle Pass at the time of his arrest." Gov. Ireland immediately wrote to Secretary Bayard, saying: "While no possible excuse can be given for the part taken by the Texas officers in the illegal arrest and delivery to the Mexican authorities, still nothing in palliation of the foul murder has or can be offered by the Mexican authorities. The persons, whoever they are, who were engaged in the illegal arrest will be prosecuted, and I demand in the name of the State and its people that this wrong by Mexico be atoned for and punished. If this State and her people must depend upon themselves for protection, the necessary redress can and will be obtained."

Secretary Bayard, on Monday, sent to Congress the Department correspondence in the Cutting case. The Secretary says that he made a demand for the release of Cutting, and was answered that Cutting was being tried for a violation of a Mexican Federal statute, which provides for the punishment of a foreigner who, in a foreign country, commits an offence against a Mexican citizen. To this Mr. Bayard replied that our Government could not tolerate the application of such a law to American citizens, and renewed his demand for Cutting's release, which has not been complied with. The charge against Cutting is that he published in Texas a libel upon a Mexican citizen living in Mexico. In calling the attention of Congress to the Cutting case and the Mexican Government's failure to release him on demand, the President says he has exhausted his powers, and the case now rests with Congress. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs have drafted resolutions approving the action of the Administration in this case, and asking it to renew its demands for Cutting's release.

A statement prepared at the Post-office Department shows that the total number of officers and employees of all grades of the Department on June 30, 1886, was 577. Of this number eighty-nine have either resigned or been removed, and their places filled by appointment since March 4, 1885.

Prohibition tickets were nominated on Wednesday in Wisconsin and Michigan. Gen. Gordon was nominated for Governor by acclamation in the Georgia Democratic Convention on Wednesday. For the other offices the incumbents were renominated. A resolution endorsing the administration of President Cleveland was adopted.

The Connecticut Prohibitionists have nominated the Rev. Samuel B. Forbes for Governor.

At a caucus of the Republican members of both houses of the California Legislature on Wednesday it was resolved to elect a United States Senator to fill the unexpired term of Senator Miller, to whose seat Gov. Stoneman appointed Senator Hearst.

At the meeting of the Aqueduct Commissioners in this city on Wednesday afternoon, Secretary James W. McCulloh was removed and John C. Sheehan was appointed in his place. Mr. Sheehan is a brother of Assemblyman Sheehan, thirty-seven years of age, and has been an active Democrat of Buffalo. The Board decided to employ Mr. McCulloh at a salary of \$6,000 per annum for two months to assist in land purchases. The whole move is outrageously political. Mr. McCulloh was a very competent and useful Secretary.

Charges prepared by the Commissioners of Accounts, at the instance of Mayor Grace, were served at four o'clock on Wednesday afternoon upon Rollin M. Squire, Commissioner of Public Works, with a notification to appear at the Mayor's office on August 4, at eleven A. M., to show cause why he should not be removed from his official position. The following are the charges: First—Mutilation of records. Second—Certifying to false pay rolls. Third—Failure to comply with the Civil-Service Law and regulations, under which twenty-three specifications of evasions of the law in the making of appointments are given. Fourth—Neglect of duty and unfitness for office. Fifth—Violation of the law and gross and culpable neglect of duty in reference to the Fifth Avenue pavement contract. Sixth—A corrupt and illegal bargain with Maurice B. Flynn to resign the office of Public Works Commissioner when called upon to do so, and to conduct the department as Mr. Flynn should dictate. Seventh—Entering into a corrupt and unlawful conspiracy with Mr. Flynn, a contractor having large dealings with the city, by placing the Department of Public Works absolutely in the control of Mr. Flynn. The last two charges are supported by an autograph letter of Mr. Squire's.

FOREIGN.

The following British Cabinet appointments have been made public: Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, the Marquis of Salisbury; Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Iddesleigh; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Marquis of Londonderry; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Randolph Churchill; Secretary for War, the Right Hon. William Henry Smith; First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord George Hamilton; Lord High Chancellor, Lord Halsbury; Secretary for India, Sir Richard Assheton Cross; Lord President of the Council, Viscount Cranbrook; President of the Local Government Board, Right Hon. Henry Chaplin; President of the Board of Trade, Col. Frederick A. Stanley; First Commissioner of Works, the Right Hon. David Plunket; Attorney-General, Sir R. E. Webster; Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Lord Ashbourne; Home Secretary, Henry Matthews; Secretary for Scotland, Arthur James Balfour; Attorney-General for Ireland, Hugh Holmes; Solicitor-General for Ireland, John Gregory Gibson; Political Secretary to the Treasury, Aretas Akers-Douglas; Lord Chamberlain, the Earl of Lathom; Judge Advocate-General, the Right Hon. W. T. Marriott; Postmaster-General, the Right Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord John Manners; Secretary of State Colonial Department, Edward Stanhope; Lord Privy Seal, Earl Cadogan; Lord Advocate, John Hay Athol Macdonald, Q. C.; Solicitor-General for Scotland, J. P. Bannerman Robertson, Q. C.; Master of the Horse, Duke of Portland. Lord Randolph Churchill's appointment is considered a great personal triumph for him. He has not, however, succeeded in squeezing out entirely what is known as the "old gang."

The following gentlemen have been recommended to the Queen by Mr. Gladstone for elevation to the peerage: Sir Thomas Brassey, Sir Michael Bass, Bart., the well-known brewer; John Glencairn Carter Hamilton, who failed of reelection to Parliament in the late contest, and Sir Henry Thring of the Treasury Department. Mr. Gladstone has also recommended that the following gentlemen be made baronets: Frederick Thorpe Mappin and Charles Mark Palmer, members of Parliament; ex-Commoner Thomas D. L. Jones-Parry and Mr. Kitson, the defeated Gladstonian candidate in Leeds. W. L. Booker, British Consul-General at New York, and John Henry G. Bergner, Superintendent of the Treaty Department of the Foreign Office, have been appointed Knights Commanders of the Order of St. Michael and St. George.

Public interest in the new Tory Cabinet is focussed on two figures. First, of course, comes Lord Randolph Churchill. This appointment has aroused indignation among the Liberals. It is seriously proposed that the Liberal party should refuse to recognize him as the leader of the House until he has apologized fully for the gross insults to Mr. Gladstone in his electoral address. Even among the Conservatives not a little disgust is privately expressed. Churchill has pledged himself in the strongest manner to the policy of immediate protection. Therefore his appointment to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer is doubly disquieting. The second figure is Mr. Henry Matthews, the Queen's counsel who conducted Mr. Crawford's case against Sir Charles Dilke with such relentless ability. He is in many respects the ablest man at the English bar. He is a Roman Catholic, is over sixty, and was the co-respondent in a divorce case twenty years ago. His surprising translation straight into one of the highest offices of the State was done by Lord Salisbury at Churchill's urgent request. Churchill declared that he must have somebody on the front Conservative bench who could be counted on at any moment for a rattling, effective party speech. He personally guaranteed Matthews's ability in this regard.

The new British Ministry received their seals of office from the Queen on Tuesday.

The last election return is now in, and counting the independents as they always vote, the following are the final totals: Conservatives 318, Liberals 194, Parnellites 85, Unionists 73.

An exchange of views among the Parnellites has led to a decision to give the Conservative Government time to prepare an Irish bill, but the Parnellites will demand a measure for the suspension of evictions.

Serious rioting took place in Belfast on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. The mob of Orangemen was fired upon by the police and soldiers, and many were wounded.

Canon MacColl, one of Mr. Gladstone's most intimate personal friends, has searched John Bright's speeches on the Irish question for many years back, and is about to issue a pamphlet on the subject in the form of an open letter to Mr. Bright, showing that up to the last few years Mr. Bright's opinions were generally in favor of home rule.

Hand-bills demanding home rule are being circulated in Wales. The Welsh members of the House of Commons propose to form a National party in Parliament on the same lines as the Parnellite party.

Tennyson has ready several new poems, the most notable of which is a continuation of "Locksley Hall," the hero reappearing, a broken-down man of eighty, with modified views of life and liberty.

The first prize of the London chess tournament was won by Blackburne.

In the Spanish Chamber of Deputies on Wednesday a resolution that the Government

free as soon as possible the remaining 26,000 slaves in Cuba was passed unanimously.

Completed returns from the districts in which elections were held on Sunday for *conseillers généraux* in France have been received. In 847 of the districts Republicans have been elected, and in 411 Conservatives have been successful. In 177 districts a second ballot will be required. The Republicans made 76 gains and the Conservatives 83.

The German army is arranging a celebration in honor of the forthcoming ninetieth birthday of the Emperor, which is intended to be fully worthy of the occasion. It is proposed to form then a union of the officers of the entire army corps, and found a philanthropic military institution in honor of the Emperor.

The celebration of the 500th anniversary of the founding of Heidelberg University was begun on Thursday night. Crown Prince Frederick William made an address.

The Abbé Franz Liszt died in Bayreuth at midnight on Friday. He was born on October 22, 1811, at Raiding, Hungary. His father, Adam Liszt, was an accountant in the house of Count Esterházy, a great patron of music. The boy heard much music and early showed so remarkable a bent in the direction of that art that a number of Hungarian noblemen, Count Esterházy among them, subscribed sufficient money to help the little prodigy to a musical education. At eight years of age he was put under notable instructors in Vienna, and before he was twelve he was considered a marvel in that city, and was declared the first pianist of the day. The period 1832-1842 marks the acme of Liszt's career as a *virtuoso*. His triumphal progress embraced almost every part of civilized Europe, from Madrid to St. Petersburg, from Hamburg to Pesh, and the enthusiasm he excited is unparalleled in the annals of music. In 1849 he settled down as conductor at Weimar and brought out operas by Berlioz and Wagner, making that city the musical centre of Germany for the rising generation. As the admirer and advocate of Wagner's music his work was particularly valuable. Liszt's compositions during the Weimar years were many. In 1861 he went to Rome, where he received religious orders with the title of Abbé, and for several years his life was devoted to meditation and church compositions. In recent years he has lived sometimes in Weimar, sometimes in Rome, with occasional visits to Bayreuth, Paris, and other musical centres. His recent visit to London and Paris was the occasion of immense enthusiasm. As a pianist Liszt was without a rival. Frau Cosima Wagner, the widow of the great composer, is an illegitimate daughter of Liszt by the Countess d'Agoult.

The following circular has been issued by the Canadian Commissioner of Customs to collectors of customs in Prince Edward's Island and Nova Scotia: "In order to avoid any misinterpretation of the concluding paragraph of my circular dated May 7 last, you will substitute the following therefor: 'If any vessel or boat of the United States is found fishing, or to have been fishing, or to be preparing to fish, within three miles of the shore within your district, you will place an officer in charge thereof, and telegraph the facts to Ottawa.' To any foreign fisherman who may come within three miles of the shore, but not fishing, preparing to fish, or having fished within such limits, you will furnish a copy of the warning, and if any such vessel shall not depart within twenty-four hours thereafter, even though such vessel is not engaged in fishing, preparing to fish, or having fished within the three-mile limit, you will place an officer in charge and immediately telegraph the fact to headquarters; or if it be ascertained subsequently to serving the warning that any vessel served therewith has been fishing or preparing to fish before or after such service, you are not to allow the twenty-four hours to expire, but put an officer on board at once and act as directed.'"

THE RECORD AS TO THE OFFICES.

THE statement submitted last week to the Senate by the President as to the number of changes in the Washington departments since his inauguration, taken in connection with the recent summary of changes among the postmasters, enables one to get a clear idea as to the civil-service record of the Administration. An analysis of the figures is full of interest.

There are now about 120,000 Federal offices, in the common sense of that term which ranks as an officer of the national Government the sweeper-out of a Federal building equally with the President of the United States. Nearly one-half of all are postmasters, who numbered 53,614 on the 30th of June. In order to compare the changes made in the post-offices under a Democratic Administration with the record under Republican Presidents, we have secured a statement giving the figures for each fiscal year back to the one ending with June, 1869, four months after Grant became President. The classes of appointments which have a political aspect are those made upon resignations and the expiration of commissions, and those made upon the removal or suspension of the previous incumbents. The first of these two classes numbered 9,112 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886. The expirations of commissions concern only the offices filled for four years by appointment of the President, which number only 500 or 600 a year, as the fourth-class offices have no fixed term. It has been claimed by Republican organs that the greater part of the resignations have been compulsory rather than voluntary, postmasters taking themselves out of the way simply to avoid inevitable removal. It has also been said that many Republican postmasters resigned because they did not believe that they could hold office under a Democratic administration without sacrificing their convictions or forfeiting their self-respect. The facts do not sustain either theory. When Senator Ingalls of Kansas, a few months ago, declared that the Republican office-holders in his State "trampled on each other in a tumultuous and indecent haste to get out of office" as soon as Cleveland came in, the *Evening Post* promptly convicted him of falsehood by showing from the official records that the facts were as follows:

"Number of post-offices in Kansas March 4, 1885, to which the President makes appointments, 89; number of appointments to such offices made during the nine months between March 4 and December 17, as published in the *Congressional Record* for December 18 last, 35; of which 7 nominations were at the expiration of the previous incumbents' terms (three of these terms expiring seven months after Mr. Cleveland's inauguration), 8 to succeed suspended officials, and only 20 to succeed postmasters who had resigned, while 54 of the 74 whose terms had not expired or who had not been suspended were still clinging to office, nearly a year after the new Administration was inaugurated."

There appears to be about as little foundation for the claim that Republican postmasters resigned in large numbers to avoid removal. Doubtless there were a considerable number of cases where men did resign because they knew that they merited removal for incompetency or offensive partisanship, but the number of such "martyrs" cannot have been very large. The whole number of appointments upon resignations and the expiration of

commissions (chiefly upon resignations) was 9,112 out of a total of 53,614 postmasters, being 17 out of every 100. This but slightly exceeds the proportion repeatedly reached under Republican Presidents. Thus in the fiscal year 1883-84 there were 7,265 such changes among 50,017 postmasters, or 14 in a hundred; in 1882-83, 7,734 out of 47,863, and in 1881-82, 7,346 out of 46,231, or 16 in a hundred; while in 1874-75 there were 6,017 out of 35,547, or 17 in a hundred—precisely the same as last year. So far, therefore, as resignations are concerned, there has been no material change in the relative number, the only difference being that such vacancies have usually been filled by Democrats instead of Republicans.

The other significant class of changes consists of appointments upon removals and suspensions, which aggregated 9,566. This is a great increase over the average of late years; the number having varied between 513 in 1883-84 and 1,045 in 1875-76; but, after all, it amounts to only 18 such changes among every 100 postmasters. It is to be regretted that the causes of removal or suspension are not given. We suspect that a considerable percentage were justified by considerations entirely disconnected with politics—in other words, that a good many hundreds, if not indeed two or three thousand, of these 9,566 deposed postmasters lost their places because they were incompetent or inefficient. But even if every such change be ascribed to partisan motives, we have only 18 changes among every 100 officials due to the fact that a Democrat instead of a Republican is President.

The statement as to the Washington departments shows that the removals or reductions in rank among chiefs of divisions and chief clerks since Cleveland's inauguration aggregate 28 in the Treasury Department out of 97; Interior, 9 out of 43; Post-office and Navy, 2 each out of 21 and 11 respectively; War and State, 1 each out of 18 and 7 respectively; and Attorney-General's office, none. The number of removals among the clerks in the various departments subject to the Civil-Service Law has been 460, while the whole number of such clerks is 5,650. That is to say, only 8 clerks out of every 100 in the departments have been turned out since the 4th of March, 1885, and there is no reason to doubt that most of these removals have been for good cause.

It would be interesting, if we had similar statistics for the custom-houses and post-offices throughout the country which are subject to the Civil-Service Law, as well as for the other branches of the public service, but further figures are not needed to warrant deductions. It is plain, not only that there has not been any "clean sweep," or anything remotely approaching a "clean sweep," but that there has been a restraint in making changes for political causes such as has never been known in this country since Jackson introduced the spoils system, nearly sixty years ago. The salient fact is this, and it is impossible to exaggerate its importance: There has been a Democratic President in the White House for nearly a year and a half, and much more than half of the offices remain in the hands of the Republicans who held them when the Republican party went out of power. By the

death-blow which he has thus dealt at the spoils system, Mr. Cleveland has both justified the confidence of his supporters, and earned for himself an enduring place in history, as a President who did his country one of the greatest services which it has ever fallen to the lot of any American citizen to render.

THE DISINTEGRATION OF PARTIES.

THE first session of Congress under a Democratic President for a quarter of a century is about expiring, and the most striking feature of its record is the evidence which it has furnished of the disintegration of parties. The dividing lines between the two old organizations have been repeatedly and thoroughly broken down, and the end of the session leaves the distinction between Republicans and Democrats so vague that labels are really necessary to distinguish members of the respective parties.

A number of questions have arisen upon which tradition should have arrayed the two parties in sharp opposition, but upon which members of each were found to be badly divided. To begin with, there was the issue of Federal aid to education in the various States. If ever a question was presented regarding which the attitude of the two parties, according to their respective theories of the Constitution, should have been clearly defined, it was this question of voting money from the Federal Treasury for expenditure in the various States under the supervision of Federal authorities. The Republican party might have been expected to support the scheme, especially as its ostensible object was the better education of the negro, but everybody would have expected on general principles to find the Democrats solid against such a proposition. Yet a Kentucky Democrat in the House, Mr. Willis, supported the project as zealously as a New Hampshire Republican, Mr. Blair, in the Senate; and of the twenty-two Democratic votes cast on the passage of the bill in the Senate, sixteen were in the affirmative, and only six in the negative, while such thorough-going Republicans as Frye and Hale of Maine, Hawley and Platt of Connecticut, Ingalls and Plumb of Kansas, opposed it in the Senate, and other equally strong Republicans were responsible for smothering the bill in the House.

The tariff issue furnished another illustration of the lack of cohesion in the two parties. Every Democrat was bound, by every consideration of party tradition and committal, to support at the very least the consideration of some measure aimed at a reform of tariff abuses, and yet 35 out of 171 Democratic votes in the House were cast against the admission of the Morrison bill. On the other hand, the most strenuous application of party discipline could not prevent the Minnesota Republican Congressmen from voting with the majority of the Democrats, and it is known that several Republican Congressmen from other Western States were restrained with difficulty from following this example. These Minnesota Republicans have been endorsed by their constituents, and the *St. Paul Pioneer-Press*, the leading Republican paper of the State, declares that "there is now one State, reliably Republican, which can be

depended upon to work for the interest of the burdened consumer against the manufacturer who has grown great upon profits extorted by the power of Government."

The Oleomargarine Bill was another which constitutional theories and partisan traditions should have made a mere test of party strength in the two branches. Alike because it involves an interference between rival industries such as certainly offends a "strict construction" of the Constitution, and because it levies a new form of taxes when an abrogation of old forms is demanded, Democrats ought to have opposed it *en masse*, while a solid Republican vote in its favor would not have been surprising. Yet one of its most earnest opponents in the House was a Republican Congressman from Chicago, with whom stood a number of his party colleagues, while 70 out of 156 Democratic votes were cast in its favor. In the Senate, 5 of the 28 Democratic votes were cast in its favor, and it finally becomes a law by the signature of a Democratic President.

Upon the question of civil-service reform each party has split to such an extent that neither can claim to be committed, as an organization, in its favor. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, a Democrat who has repeatedly been elected Speaker by his party, led in a movement to annul the Civil-Service Law, but he was ably opposed in debate by Democratic Representatives, and beaten by his own party when the matter came to a vote. On the other hand, while the Republicans in the Senate have posed as the especial champions of the reform, the votes of Republican Senators have been ready to confirm the nomination of even such notoriously unfit Democrats as Thomas, Senator Gorman's unsavory protégé, for Indian Inspector.

The financial issue has ceased to divide the two parties. In the House 49 out of 112 Republicans, and in the Senate 13 out of 36, voted for the surplus resolution in its original form, which violated all the traditions of the party as a sound-money organization.

Even the purely political issues of the "rebels" and the "poor negro" no longer divide Congressmen according to party lines. Three Republican Senators voted last spring to repeal that section of the Revised Statutes which debars ex-Confederates from holding commissions in the United States Army; and this proposition, which only a few years ago would have been loudly denounced as "disloyal" by every Republican organ, only failed of passage because a fourth Republican Senator cast his vote in the negative through a misapprehension. Not long after, Fitz John Porter, whom but a few years ago it was a matter of Republican faith to condemn as a "traitor," was vindicated by the help of eight Republican votes in the same body; and on Monday a Republican Senate, by a vote of 33 to 15, confirmed his nomination by a Democratic President to his old place in the army. At the same time the fact came out that the rejection of a competent negro for the office of Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia was due to Republican votes, only one Senator of that party joining thirteen Democrats in voting to confirm a colored man for a lucrative position.

It is needless to multiply illustrations. Those which we have cited cover the field, and show that on no question now before the country, whether growing out of ante-bellum traditions, the "issues of the war," or new relations, does the line of division between men correspond with the nomenclature of parties. In fact, it is hardly too much to say that there is nothing left of the old parties except their nomenclature. One man calls himself a Republican, another a Democrat; but nobody can tell from that fact whether he is for or against any particular line of policy in public affairs.

CHARMING UGLY PEOPLE.

SAINT-SIMON'S *Memoirs* is the most consoling book in the world for ugly people. Half the men and women we meet in his pages are without personal beauty, but by no means without charm; and one is almost deluded into the belief that the body is rather as a costume at a masquerade than a costume on the stage, and neither indicates nor influences the part one plays. Occasionally he carries his liberal courteousness of description to a somewhat comic extreme, as when he says of Mme. de Foix: "She was the prettiest humpback ever seen; tall, in early years dancing most charmingly, and having so much grace that one could not wish that she were not humpback. She was very little at court, very much in the great world; . . . extremely amusing, without the least malice; and never more than fifteen years old, when she died childless at fifty-five, regretted by every one."

But other deformities than of figure abounded. The ugliness and suffering because the art of dentistry did not yet exist were widespread, and there was one poor woman whose toothlessness marred her fortunes. The King and Mme. de Maintenon, both of them, were always attracted by a pretty face and repelled by an ugly one—"ils se prenaient fort aux figures"—and they could not accept as a *dame d'atour* of Mme. la duchesse de Berri a certain Mme. de Cheverny, a person of much merit, but with "un visage dégoûtant." She was a niece of Colbert, and had decided cleverness and ability, and was agreeable in conversation. Moreover, she had been much liked at Vienna and at Copenhagen, where her husband was ambassador. But in Denmark she, and her husband also, had suffered from scurvy. "They had both left in that country almost all their teeth," says Saint-Simon, adding, "and perhaps they would have done better to have brought none back." This catastrophe, in connection with a bad complexion, was something the King could not accustom himself to, and he finally declared that he could not endure to have this face always about him and often at his table and in his society. "No one but the King would have felt so," says Saint-Simon; but none the less Mme. de Cheverny could not be *dame d'atour*. The King himself was sadly toothless in his last years, and one day, when dining, always surrounded by his courtiers, he complained to the Cardinal d'Estrees of the inconvenience of having no teeth. "Teeth! Sire," exclaimed the kindly, absent-minded, courteous old Cardinal. "Ah! but who has any?" The answer was all the more a jest to the bystanders because the Cardinal himself had very white and beautiful teeth, and his pleasant but very large mouth was so shaped as to show them fully. Even the King could not but laugh.

Most extraordinary must have been the appearance of Mme. de Nemours, the step-daughter of the famous Duchesse de Longueville, who had

"a very odd face, and a way of dressing herself, like the servant of a nunnery, which was still odder; great eyes which saw nothing; a tic which kept one of her shoulders always jerking; white hair, which was flying everywhere," and "the most stately air in the world"! "She was extremely rich and lived in great splendor and with much dignity. . . . She was haughty, too, to the last point, and had infinite cleverness, with an eloquent and animated tongue to which she permitted all things."

Carelessness concerning the toilette distinguished these real aristocrats—the beautiful as well as the plain. "The most beautiful woman in France," Mme. d'Armagnac—who, by the way, was so in spite of "a wretched figure, short and dumpy"—most beautiful to the last day of her life (when she was sixty-eight years old), and one of the greatest of the great—was always "without rouge or ribbons or laces, without gold or silver, with no sort of ornament, always dressed in black or gray, with her skirt caught up as if she were some sort of nurse, with a round mob-cap, her hair dressed low without powder or curls, a collar of black silk, and a short and flat coif—always the same, whether at home or with the King." This was a person who passed her life holding the greatest "state" of all the court, and who never in her life condescended to give her hand or an armchair in her own house to any woman of whatsoever rank.

In complete contrast to such an existence was that of Mme. de Luxembourg, the wife of the famous marshal-duke. She, one could almost believe, must have been the ugliest woman in France, and she and her husband were at first glance a terribly well-assorted pair in appearance, for he had a moderate hump in front, and a very large and very pointed hump behind, with all the other usual accompanying deformities of humpbacks. But he was like Riquet à la Houpe. His appearance, "d'abord fort rebutante," one became accustomed to, Saint-Simon says, to a degree "which can be understood by no one who has not seen him"; and there was about him an air "of fire and nobleness and natural graces which shone in his simplest actions." But his poor wife had nothing of fire and nobleness and natural graces; she was nothing but ugly and rich. "She was frightfully ugly both in figure and face; she had the air and look and demeanor of those great common fish-women who sit [at the market] in a barrel-chair (*tonneau*) with their warming-pans under them; but she was very rich." So M. de Bouteville (as he was then) married her as a stepping-stone to a dukedom. He soon sent her off to his castle of Ligny, where "her sad and darkened life" was passed almost entirely in melancholy solitude. She rarely came to Paris, and lived and died greatly ill-treated, greatly neglected.

The famous Duc de Lauzun was "un petit homme blondasse," and without "agrément dans le visage"; in fact he was insignificant in appearance, so that Marshal Berwick says of him: "Sa figure étoit fort mince, et l'on ne peut comprendre comme il a pu être un homme à bonne fortune." None the less La Bruyère, describing him (under the name of Straton in his chapter "De la Cour"), could say without exaggeration, "His life is a romance: no, it lacks probability (*il lui manque le vraisemblable*). He has not had adventures, he has had brilliant dreams and bad dreams. What am I saying? No one dreams as he has lived." Saint-Simon, his brother-in-law (they married sisters), referring to this characterization, says that to those who knew him most closely even in his old age "ce mot semble avoir encore plus de justesse." La Bruyère, it may be believed, revealed the secret, or at least one corner of the secret, of Lauzun's manifold multiplied, incredible, bewildering successes in

these cutting words: "Il a dit de soi, 'J'ai de l'esprit, j'ai du courage,' et tous ont dit après lui, 'Il a de l'esprit, il a du courage.'" But Berwick shows another corner in saying: "Il étoit noble dans ses manières."

The descendants of the Great Condé—himself small in stature—were scarcely more than dwarfs. His grandson, M. le Duc, was a gnome rather than a man, and in character as well as appearance; but he was a person of great importance and weight in the world. His three sisters were dubbed by the beautiful, cruel Mme. la Duchesse, "les poupées du sang"; yet one of them, the Duchesse du Maine, made herself one of the most conspicuous and remarkable personages of the day, and later won no little admiration from Voltaire, though to style her charming would be something of a misnomer. Another "petite poupée manquée" and very ugly, "was Mme. de Castries, a really learned and very brilliant woman, with the greatest grace and charm of mind and expression."

But we have left the most effective illustration of our thesis to the last. Even the Duchess of Burgundy, the enchanting young Dauphiness, was "unmistakably ugly," but, like the humpback of Mme de Foix, her "soupçon de goitre" was not unbecoming! The whole long description of her person is worth quoting, from the extraordinary vividness of the impression it conveys of sweetness, grace, and vivacity, transforming the most deplorable imperfections into almost desirable foils, as it were, of the charms they accompanied; or into shadows only heightening the glow of winning attractiveness:

"Regularly ugly, flabby cheeks; a prominent forehead; a perfectly insignificant nose; thick, pouting lips; hair and eyebrows of chestnut brown and very well set; the most speaking and the most beautiful eyes in the world; few teeth and all decayed, which she did not hesitate to refer to and jest about; the most beautiful color and the most beautiful skin; a small but admirable neck; a long throat, with the least little goitre, which was not amiss (*qui ne lui seyait point mal*); an elegant, gracious, majestic carriage of the head, and a glance imprinted with the same character; the most expressive smile; a long, round, delicate, flexible, perfectly modelled waist; the motion in walking of a goddess on clouds—she pleased utterly. The graces floated round her steps, and her manners, and her most common talk. She always charmed by her simple and natural air, not infrequently naïf, but flavored with cleverness, and by that ease which she possessed to such a degree as to communicate it to all who approached her. Her youthful, lively, active gaiety animated everything, and her nymph-like lightness carried her everywhere like an eddying breeze which fills many places at once, giving to them movement and life. She adorned every spectacle, was the soul of fêtes, pleasures, balls, and was ravishing there from the gracefulness and precision and perfection of her dancing."

This was the external delightfulness of this charming princess, whom Mme. de Caylus, no less than Saint-Simon, represents as in character and disposition no ordinary woman. But what we would particularly dwell on here and now is the comfort (and the lesson!) to be derived from such a picture, by young women who have flabby cheeks, ugly noses, thick lips, bad teeth—and a goitre!

THE ELECTIONS FROM AN IRISH STAND-POINT.

DUBLIN, July 24, 1886.

THE elections are over. Mr. Gladstone has been defeated. In Ireland the interest centred around four contests in Ulster, where the Liberal-Unionists have gained two seats from the Nationalists and the Nationalists have gained one. Mr. Healy lost South Derry to the Conservatives by 108 votes; Mr. O'Brien South Tyrone, by 99 votes. At a previous election they won as land-

reformers, in spite of their nationality; they have now lost as Nationalists notwithstanding their services as land-reformers. Mr. Sexton captured West Belfast from the Conservatives by 103 votes. Justin McCarthy has again unsuccessfully contested Derry City; he reduced his adversary's majority from 29 to 3. In this latter contest the Nationalists have petitioned for a scrutiny; and lodged the necessary £1,000. If they succeed, they will again hold the majority in Ulster. There have been no such close contests anywhere else in Ireland. The Unionists and Conservatives felt hopeful of winning South County Dublin, and one division of the city, but were beaten by increased majorities as compared with last election; the relative majorities being 1,768 and 2,443. The Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, which worked the elections in Ireland against the Nationalists and those in Great Britain against all Gladstone candidates, allowed most of the elections in the South and West to fall to the Nationalists uncontested. The Nationalists loudly protested against the uselessness and absurdity of many of the contests still forced upon them; but themselves fought Dublin University, where they were beaten by 1,870 to 56 votes. There have been several changes in the Nationalist ranks, but upon the whole, when Mr. Healy and Mr. O'Brien have been provided with seats, as, of course, they will be, the party will have been considerably strengthened. A bitter opponent has, however, been established in the person of Mr. T. W. Russell, who took South Tyrone from Mr. O'Brien. Born in Scotland, he has lived nearly all his life in Ireland, where he has devoted his talents as a speaker and organizer to the temperance cause, and where he became a prominent public character. Defeated as a Radical or Liberal at the previous elections in England, he has gone over to the I. L. P. U., and is likely to prove a thorn in the side of the Irish party and of many of his old English coadjutors, such as Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

There was some bad rioting in Belfast. It commenced with a savage attack on Catholic workmen in retaliation for real or supposed threats from a Catholic foreman of what he and his would do when they had home rule. These riots would not occur if neither party minded what the other said or implied by banners and processions—in other words, if human nature were perfect. But probably there is no civilized country where they could be avoided if a small dominant minority paraded from time to time their assertion of superiority and of right to ascendancy over the majority of their fellow-countrymen, and their opposition to national sentiments. Why are these Orangemen often armed while their opponents are unarmed even in districts where arms acts are in force? Because hitherto the magistrates who have the licensing power under those acts are often also Orangemen. How is it that the Orange party fight with so much spirit? Because they know that "the forces of civilization" arrayed against disorder are in the main directed by their own side; that if summoned they will be tried before magistrates and judges who in the main sympathize with them, and by juries where-on Orangemen will be the majority. All danger of trouble from this party will disappear when the majority rules in Ireland.

Turning to Great Britain, the first thing that strikes us is the extent to which dissenting Scotland and Wales have supported Mr. Gladstone—in the face of the fear of Catholicism in Ireland which worked so powerfully on the Conservative side, and which it was natural to suppose would have worked more strongly with Dissenters than with Churchmen. It is difficult to understand the dismay with which the result of the elections is received by many of Mr. Gladstone's supporters. A majority on our side could not have been reasonably expected. Could any one have

believed a year ago that Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, and a score of other prominent Englishmen would come out as they have done on the question of home rule; or that 191 Englishmen and Scotchmen would be returned at a general election pledged to support the Irish Nationalists? The hopes of immediate settlement prevalent three months ago were as unreasonable as is the discouragement of to-day. Perhaps it is the same in other countries, but occasional sudden collapse of old systems and old wrongs in England is very striking. Up till the last moment the sustainers of rotten boroughs, Slavery, Corn-laws, Contagious Diseases Acts, Coercion, appeared to be skating on firm ice. Suddenly it gave way. They had not allowed for the forces quietly working beneath them. In the present instance the ice has, to a certain extent, given way; but the British public is, upon the whole, as yet too uninstructed to make the catastrophe so immediate or complete as in cases where the agitation had been carried on in and mainly affected Great Britain itself.

Mr. Gladstone and his friends are convinced (and even regarding their conviction some of us would feel more confidence in steady progress if the change had not come quite so suddenly—if there was not so much of the enthusiasm of neophytes about some of the converts)—Mr. Gladstone and his friends are honestly convinced; but the masses of the British people are profoundly ignorant on the whole question. Their inevitable ignorance is the measure of their incapacity to understand Ireland. The writer attended several meetings large and small in London during the late canvass, and was profoundly impressed by the sympathy shown towards Ireland, by the desire of the audiences to do her justice, by the attention with which Irish speakers were heard. It was also evident how easily on many important points those same audiences might have been swayed by speakers in an opposite direction. The English have not the same keen interest in politics as we have. Their minds are differently constituted. English audiences always strike one as guileless compared to our audiences—as if they were more used to being told the truth, as if they had not to discount speech on both sides as we in Ireland discount it. Our "frank open-heartedness" is really a myth. Whether in public or in private, we are deeper and more reserved than our Saxon neighbors. We may appear open enough on the surface, but you must long and well know an Irishman before you know him as you may often know an Englishman on short acquaintance. Hitherto the home-rule agitation has not been carried on upon the principle of instructing Englishmen. It is new for leading Irishmen to address English audiences with arguments based upon an essentially English view of the situation. So far as appears, until this election the National League never spent £50 on the dissemination of campaign literature in Great Britain. Within the past few weeks the League has largely distributed such literature across the Channel, but too much from an Irish point of view; too much in the spirit of ordinary Nationalist newspaper leading articles. The Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union has done better. Its literature has been prepared with greater care, has been better adapted to the English mind, has been more carefully and faithfully disseminated, and has had weighty effect in leading the issue of the elections.

It is noticeable the extent to which eminent literary and scientific men have taken sides against Mr. Gladstone—many of them Radicals in British and European politics, such as Mr. Swinburne. There have been also some strange cleavages. It is remarked by a competent observer that agitators for women's suffrage have

in the main opposed Mr. Gladstone, while the workers with Mrs. Josephine Butler support him. The reduction in the numbers polled, more pronounced in England than in Ireland, is of course due to the removals and other changes since the preparation of the election lists last autumn. M. de Laveleye has done good service in pointing out, in the *Full Mall Gazette*, the anomalies and absurdities arising from our custom of spreading the elections over some weeks. This system, however, exercises a more distracting influence in England than it does here, where direct appeals to "vote for the winning side" would have little effect. Polite boycotting has been successful in preventing the Protestant home-rulers from having as much influence in the elections as was expected.

The rise in the value of many Irish stocks, which has taken place within the past few days, is triumphantly indicated by the opponents of home rule. The principal cause of this rise is the unexpectedly high dividends announced by some of the railway lines. The shelving of home rule has undoubtedly had something to do with it, but the Government was known to be beaten some days before the rise set in. The general current rate of interest has of late tended steadily to decrease, and this has helped the appreciation.

Although the ultimate attainment of some form of home rule is more than ever assured, the immediate future is more than ever uncertain. We can note the forces for and against, but we cannot estimate their relative strength and persistency. The real difficulty regarding a settlement is the bitter opposition of the wealthy and, in the main, of the "educated" classes in Ireland. The movement for home rule has distinctly entered on a new phase. It is not too much to say that the heart of the Irish people has been deeply touched and drawn towards England by the attitude of Mr. Gladstone and his party, and by the masses of her people. More has been effected for real union in the time than could at all have been expected. It is only to be regretted that the progress of this feeling has been checked by the results of the election. Reversion to a genuinely coercive policy is almost an impossibility. For one thing, the permanent civil service in Ireland, upon which the Government must rely for the administration of the law, has been profoundly influenced by the declarations of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, Earl Spencer, and by the attitude of the Earl and Countess of Aberdeen. It can never again be counted upon to the same extent as before as a passive instrument against nationality and Nationalist leaders. It is seven years since the present leaders took up their position, which time and altered circumstances have somewhat modified. They cannot revert to the methods by which they gained the hearts of the Irish people and obtained their first success. They have now at their command other and higher forces. All depends upon whether these are wielded as effectually as the former ruder weapons. If so, near victory is certain. If not, we may be entering a slack period; we may have to wait for the fresh impetus which will inevitably be supplied by a younger generation. Perusing, in the *Nation* of the 8th inst., the article entitled "Twenty-one Years," the present writer felt painfully what a long and weary period awaits Ireland before similar words will apply to her, pointing the moral of the healing and uniting effects upon a nation of the removal of a great anomaly, such as slavery was with you, and such as the subjection of the majority is with us.

One bright, one very bright ray we have had with us the past few months, and that a change of Ministry will remove—namely, the vicereignty of the Earl and Countess of Aberdeen. Their deep and heartfelt sympathy with all classes,

their genuine desire for unity upon a common platform of love of humanity and of country, their untiring efforts to cheer the poor and suffering, have never been exceeded and will never be forgotten among us. And a strong new bond has been established between the countries in the many friends of Ireland and her cause so unexpectedly raised up of late among the English, headed by one who, we trust, may yet see the fulfilment of his aspirations for Ireland and the entire United Kingdom. D. B.

THE DUC DE BROGLIE'S RECOLLECTIONS.—IV.

PARIS, July 14, 1886.

FROM 1828 to 1830 the liberal tide was constantly rising in France. The fatal crisis was first avoided by the constitution of the administration of M. de Martignac. He had become Prime Minister almost by accident, but he showed, with much eloquence, great prudence and firmness. The Duc de Broglie, with his usual candor, laments much over the fact that he helped to separate from this Ministry the *doctrinaires*, and thus caused, perhaps, the fall of a Cabinet, "our last anchor," and perhaps the Revolution of July.

France was at this moment sending an expedition to the Morea; volunteers of all ages, of all ranks, were enlisting, and France appeared as a liberator in Greece. But general attention was soon turned exclusively to home affairs. The King was preparing a real *coup d'état*. On the 27th of July, 1829, the day before the end of the session, he had summoned M. de Polignac to Saint-Cloud. Eight days afterwards, on the 8th of August, appeared in the *Moniteur* an *ordonnance* appointing Polignac Minister of Foreign Affairs, with La Bourdonnais, Bourmont, and other ultras, notoriously hostile to the *Charte* and partisans of an exclusive prerogative in the King. The Duc de Broglie learned the news at Caunterets, a watering-place in the Pyrenees. Chateaubriand was there also; Lafayette was in Auvergne, his native country. The latter made, at a great banquet, the first protest against the Polignac Cabinet. He had returned from the United States, where he had made a triumphal march, which he renewed in the French provinces of Dauphiné, Burgundy, Lyonnais. He was everywhere received by the municipal authorities; he went from banquet to banquet, amid illuminations and under triumphal arches.

Royer-Collard would not believe that the new Cabinet would dare to make a *coup d'état*, for the Cabinet had no majority in the Chambers; the opposition all over the country was formidable. The new Ministers were royalist demagogues, who expected that the King could always appeal to the masses of the people; their political ideal was the absence of any organism between the sovereign and the multitude. The struggle began when the Chamber met; the Committee on the Address inserted this phrase in the answer to the royal speech:

"The intervention of the country in the deliberation of the public interests is consecrated by the *Charte*. The *Charte* makes the permanent harmony of the political views of your Government with the wishes of the people the indispensable condition of the regular march of public affairs. Our devotion to you compels us to say that this harmony does not exist."

This was surely strong language. The phrase was the work of Royer-Collard himself, the old and stanch royalist, the great jurist, the proud man who answered in 1814 to the offer of a title, "Noble vous-même." The address was adopted by 221 votes against 181, and read to the King on the 18th of March. The King answered thus:

"I have heard the address which you bring to me in the name of the Chamber of Deputies. I

had a right to count on the help of both Chambers to accomplish all the good I meditate; my heart suffers at the declaration of the Deputies of the departments who tell me that this concert does not exist. I have announced my resolutions in the opening speech of the session: they are immovable. The interests of my people forbid me to depart from them. My Ministers will make my intentions known to you."

A few days afterward, the Duke of Orleans gave a great ball to the King and Queen of Naples at the Palais Royal. It was a truly Neapolitan fête, and there were some fireworks at the end. M. de Salvandy approached the Duke of Orleans and said to him: "We are at the foot of Vesuvius and we dance before the eruption." The eruption came soon; on the 16th of May the Chamber was dissolved. The electoral campaign began at once with unusual fierceness. The result was crushing for the Government: out of 428 deputies the Opposition returned 270, and the Government only 145.

The Ministers were not discouraged, and prepared themselves for a *coup d'état*. Baron de Vitrolles tells, in his curious memoirs, how he stopped on the 25th of July at the château of Saint-Cloud, the residence of Charles X. He had thanked the King for his recent promotion to the peerage a few days before, and found him very silent and unwilling to discuss the situation. He found this time M. de Polignac and his colleagues at Saint-Cloud. They all looked pre-occupied, as did the King. On his way to the chapel M. de Vitrolles remarked to one of the Ministers: "I don't ask you for your secret, but I will tell you that the fate of the monarchy itself is in question." He told another that the situation had completely changed; that an act of force would find resistance prepared. Charles X. came back from the chapel. His face was more serious than ever; his phrases more short, his complexion redder. He entered the Council room with his Ministers. The famous *ordonnances* were read, textually, to the King, as well as the Report which was their justification. The King hesitated a moment before giving his signature, and, finally, shaking his white head, he said: "The more I think, the more I am convinced that it is impossible to do otherwise." "Gentlemen," said he to his Ministers, after they had signed, "the sacrifice is accomplished; you can count on me as I can count on you. Between us it is now a matter of life and death.

Vitrolles on that same day went in the evening to Saint-Leu, where a dinner was given by the Duke of Bourbon in honor of the Duke and Duchess of Orleans. The Duke of Orleans looked very anxious, and, seeing M. de Vitrolles, asked him: "You were at Saint-Cloud this morning? What do you think?" Vitrolles painted the scene he had witnessed and prophesied great changes. "But what can they do?" said the Duke. "They cannot dispense with the *Charte* or the Chambers." While the old Prince de Condé was entertaining his guests with private theatricals, one of the Ministers carried the *ordonnances* to the editor of the *Moniteur*, the official paper, who read them, and showed great agitation. "I am," said he, "forty-seven years old. I have seen all the great days of the Revolution, and I confess that I am full of terror."

On the 26th of July, in the morning, M. Villemain entered the cabinet of the Duc de Broglie and found him meditating as usual—"nescio quid meditans nugarum, totus in illis." The *Moniteur* was on his table and he had not opened it. "Well!" said Villemain, "have you seen this morning's crimes?" The Duke opened the paper and saw the "crimes." They both went out and visited their friends. The first act of resistance came from the press; the first *ordonnance* was the death-warrant of all the papers. A protest was written by Thiers, who was then a writer for the *National*, and signed by forty-seven names,

which have all since become more or less famous. A double decision was rendered immediately, by the civil tribunal and by the commercial tribunal, ordering the printers of two papers to print the *ordonnances*, notwithstanding the prohibition of the conductors. The Duc de Broglie had gone to the House of Peers, to the office of the *Globe*, of the *Revue Française*. He offered a hiding-place in his house to M. de Rémusat, one of the journalists who had signed the protest.

Paris was already in a state of fermentation. No arms were yet visible; but the next day, "going down the quay," says the Duke, "towards twelve, I heard for the first time, but at a great distance, the fusillade. The noise became more and more distinct. Marmont, Duke of Ragusa, had not many troops, only three or four thousand men; he was expecting reinforcements. Barricades were made everywhere. The people were looking for arms." Then began the standing strategy of Parisian civil wars, which consists in bringing from the Tuileries to the Hôtel de Ville three parallel columns—one on the boulevards, the second in the Rue St. Honoré, the third along the quays. Meanwhile the deputies of the Opposition met at various places. Guizot, Laffitte, the banker, Lafayette, who had arrived from the provinces, proposed that a deputation should ask the Duke of Ragusa for an armistice. Every hour, every minute, the revolt became more energetic, and the number of the rebels increased. Marmont's little columns fought in vain, keeping their ground, but they were like ships on a tempestuous ocean. By the evening of the 28th of July the insurrection was absolute mistress of Paris, with the exception of the Louvre, the Tuileries, the Bank, and the Champs Élysées. The next day two of the regiments stationed in the Place Vendôme had joined the insurrection; the Louvre was invaded. At twelve the Duke of Ragusa was in full retreat. Paris was lost to Charles X. and belonged to the insurrection. A revolutionary Government took possession of the Hôtel de Ville. The Bourbons were lost, but who would give a new government to France? Fortunately for the country, the movement had responsible leaders. The Hôtel de Ville tried to establish a sort of Commune, but the republicans were not many in 1830; they had no great men to direct their efforts, no organization, no communication with the provinces. They were an unorganized force, and their situation obliged them to lean on the populace, on the multitude which is found in all the great capitals, always ready for agitation and crime.

The situation, however, was very critical: such men as Laffitte, Lafayette, Casimir Périer had to ask themselves questions difficult to answer and to take responsibilities difficult to bear. The Duc de Broglie, in the negotiations which prepared a new government, took a much more active part than we were aware of. He understood at once that in order to have what might be called a minimum of revolution it was necessary to associate as many peers as possible in the work to be done. He multiplied himself, he tried to form a new Cabinet. While he was at work a young man, already known as a journalist, M. Thiers, had boldly gone to the Duke of Orleans, had shown him the necessity of saving monarchical institutions by a change of dynasty. Louis Philippe had not taken any part in the late events. He was too wise not to understand the folly of the *ordonnances* and their danger. He has been often blamed for not having accepted the mere title of regent, and governed in the interest of the child who became the Comte de Chambord. He remembered the dreadful accusations brought against the Regent of Orleans. If the young heir to the Crown had died, there would have been hundreds and thousands of Lagrange-Chancels to write new "Philippiques." He did not hesitate

long: the following proclamation was placarded on the door of M. Laffitte, at the Bourse, and in all the public places:

"Charles X. can never more reënter Paris: the blood of the people has been shed.

"The republic would expose us to horrible divisions; it would separate us from Europe.

"The Duke of Orleans is a prince devoted to the cause of the revolution.

"The Duke of Orleans has never fought against France.

"The Duke of Orleans was at Jemmapes.

"The Duke of Orleans has borne the national colors; the Duke of Orleans alone can still bear them.

"The Duke of Orleans has pronounced himself; he accepts the *Charte* as we have always understood it.

"He will receive his crown from the French people."

What followed is well known: how the Duke of Orleans was first appointed Lieutenant-General, how he went between the barricades, at the risk of his life, on horseback, surrounded by a people excited by three days' fighting; and how, by his mere presence, he dissolved the Communist and anarchical organization which was there establishing itself and trying already to terrorize France; how Charles the Tenth, with his guards, retired to Rambouillet, and afterwards left Rambouillet and France; how the new King, the Citizen King, as he was then called, took the oath to the *Charte* before the Peers and the Deputies. All this belongs to history; but the Duc de Broglie has found the means of making an old story appear new. His 'Souvenirs' of the Revolution of 1830 are among the most accurate, the most extraordinary and exciting, historical documents of our time.

Correspondence.

TRAFFIC IN VOTES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In one of Macaulay's essays, speaking of a biographer, he says there seems to have been a compact by which the family should furnish papers and the author should furnish praise. You and I might be suspected of a similar arrangement as to fact and theory. I did not and do not know how the facts stand in regard to your editorial with the above heading, but it is what I have long looked for, and believe the evil is only beginning. There are two good and sufficient reasons why it should be so. In the first place, a vote has no meaning and no value, and if it can be sold for anything, it is turning nothing into something—a temptation which the Yankee, not to say the human, mind can never resist. A community is never in greater danger than when its most solemn procedure is a sham and a humbug. A Governor of Massachusetts is to be elected this fall. The candidates of the two parties are men of very little personal and absolutely no political significance. There will be two conventions of 1,000 delegates each, who will come together at considerable expense and trouble, and are supposed to make nominations. In fact, they will merely register the decree of a secret committee, and might just as well have stayed at home. The people are then asked to vote for Mr. 1 or Mr. 2 as the nominee of their respective conventions. They know nothing of either personally, they know that neither represents any policy, or has any share in administration; the best to be hoped from either being that he will be a figure-head, and not share in or endorse stealing. It is just the same with elections to Congress and the State legislatures. You cannot permanently fool the people in that way. The first thing they will do is to stay away from the polls, and the second is to sell their votes, like any other useless rubbish, to the highest bidder.

The second reason flows directly from the first. Inasmuch as no person or party represents anything; inasmuch as no real honor and very little advantage is to be gained from office, the quality of the candidates declines though their number increases, and how to settle their conflicting claims is a matter of no small difficulty. Few people have any idea of the elaborateness of the existing arrangements for assigning nominations or, in other words, offices. Hitherto the basis has been "spoils" or the dividing of offices among the managers. Civil-service reform, so far as it has gone, has spoiled this little game; but whether permanently remains to be seen. If so, it will need to be replaced by something else. Candidates very much prefer, however, spending Government money to spending their own, a proposition curiously illustrated by the flood of private pension bills which have passed Congress this year, and which are simply an expedient for replacing the use of the offices of which the politicians think themselves so unjustly and absurdly deprived. Fortunately they have encountered the Presidential veto, but if all such expedients fail, we shall have the purchase of votes on a gigantic scale by a far worse class of men, with the intention of fully repaying themselves with a profit for their outlay from the public purse, the whole involving the decay of our institutions at a pretty rapid pace.

How is so terrible an evil to be averted? I should say by an exact reverse of "a dearth of political issues and a decadence of party spirit." I would make the people feel that the character of public men and events depends directly upon their votes, and makes the consequences as immediate and visible as possible. The Governor of a State should govern. He should reach every branch of administration through his own chosen agents for whom he is responsible, instead of the work being done by anonymous commissions or separately elected officials, over neither of whom has he any control, and for whom neither he nor anybody else is responsible. The legislatures, instead of meddling with executive work by their secret committees, should act as critics in bringing the plans and conduct of the executive constantly home to the people. The latter would then soon begin to take a pride in their votes, and to regard the sale of them as a shameful thing. And this would be backed up by penalties. The wholesale purchase of votes is not a thing to be done in secret. There is no great difficulty in discovery and conviction. But then a mere law is not sufficient for this, as our people are in many other particulars learning, to their disappointment and loss. It requires strong administration—a thing of which the people of this country, in public affairs at least, are fast losing all conception. In other words, the remedy is in the reform of the conditions of executive power. It is perfectly useless to try at present to make people see this in State affairs, as anybody can convince himself by a little experiment. But in the national Government only one link is wanting, and it is there the beginning must be made.

It is for this reason that I hold with such tenacity to the idea of admitting the Cabinet officers to Congress; not as a mere expedient for doing business, but as a great principle, involving more for the welfare of this country than perhaps any other single one. If it succeeds, its beneficent influence will soon be sought for by the States and cities.

G. B.

Boston, Aug. 2, 1886.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the extremely interesting letter signed "G. B." (*Nation*, No. 1100), the writer contrasts

the working, in France and England respectively, of a responsible Ministry with seats in the Chamber. He says in France the system is clearly unworkable, "because the Ministers are too much responsible to the Chamber and too little to the people."

May I suggest that the reason of this is, the non-existence in France of an element essential to the success of the system? The French have no educated and patriotic provincial press. In England, on the other hand, there is a provincial press, politically educated and wisely patriotic. It is a bridge which, arching over the heads of the Parliamentary majority, connects the Cabinet and the people.

HERBERT H. MOTT.

WAYLAND, MASS., Aug. 2, 1886.

A SEATTLE PROTECTIONIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: The frank speech uttered last night by a Seattle protectionist seems to me worth recording. He was waiting on the wharf for a steamer, and fell to discussing the coal of the region. "It's good coal," he said. "It ain't exactly hard, and it ain't exactly soft, and it ain't just the thing for what you'd use hard coal or soft coal for; but it's good coal. The mines ain't working now. Those foreign fellows can undersell us, and it's a — shame that the Government don't raise the duties."

W.

TACOMA, WASH. TER., July 22, 1886.

STRIKING FOR LONGER HOURS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: An instance of the tyranny of labor organizations has come to my notice which seems to me worthy of public attention. Tailors and cutters in Philadelphia have been accustomed to work ten hours a day for six days a week—in all, sixty hours a week—until last spring. Then a strike was instituted by the Knights of Labor to obtain a reduction of two hours a day.

For some twelve years the employees of one firm, Snyder, Harris, Bassett & Co., had been required to work but fifty-two hours a week. These hours had been voluntarily fixed by the firm for reasons of their own. The relations of this firm and their men had been so friendly that none of the men had joined labor organizations. They did not complain of their hours, did not wish to join the strikers, and for several days did not. But finally, fearing the persecution of the Knights, they became Knights and joined in the strike. They finally came back to work on the terms agreed upon by committees of manufacturers and employees, but, to their chagrin, found their weekly hours increased by their strike from fifty-two to fifty-four hours.

A. W. HARRIS.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.,
July 29, 1886.

THE ECONOMY OF FEES AND TIPS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: There was lately afforded to the readers of the *Evening Post* the great gratification of a brief treatise on the true inwardness of giving fees. It was a great gratification because it came from one who is himself in the way of fees, or with an eye to fees—a waiter, in fact, by profession. It was soon made to appear by this philosopher of fees and tips that the general objector to them had no legs to stand on, and was a good-for-nothing creature after all. It was quite right, he showed, that when a waiter had taken especial pains with his table, had even jeopardized his income by purchasing flowers with which to adorn (or perhaps to screen) the immaculate linen, there should be given to him a moderate compensation

for his pains. Unfortunately this little apology from the interested party is a most barefaced kind of special pleading and, "not to put too fine a point on it," as Mr. Snagsby remarks, quite absurd. The question is generally—at least in this country—Has a waiter or other servant any just claim on the customer who pays the regular price of the food, service, or whatever it may be? There is an economical question involved in fees and tips that it would be well to consider.

The fee or tip is, like several other things of domestic life, a survival of ancient usage. It is easily shown that the practice dates from a time when all trades and arts were of a servile origin and station, and ministered to the more respectable offices of militant life. The people that took part in them were mostly in the condition of slaves or retainers, and if there was doled out to them a pittance occasionally besides their regular keep in the household or castle, they must be satisfied. One by one the various trades, arts, and professions passed from the servile state of industry to the state of patronage until finally enfranchised, as they are in an industrial era. Status has mostly given way to contract. But whereas the physician and the artist and the tradesman generally have been emancipated from the fee-giving condition, those whose business is domestic or public service are only half emancipated. They receive a half wage and expect to pick up the rest; consequently their income is precarious, and they are constantly engaged in trying to extort, overawe, shame their employers or their employers' customers into satisfying their claims. Of course, extra service, as in an accident or sickness, demands extra compensation; what we are considering is the service that is supposed to be included in the set price or charges. Those who give fees for regular service help keep the servant in his servile condition and continue his precarious income. The requisite income or wages should come from the employer, and would be a constant and assured amount that could be depended on. It would cost the customer no more to pay the additional fee in the bill as regular charges, and then the servant or waiter would have a determinate sum on which to live, and would not need to degrade himself by all manner of shifts and insulting devices to screw out a fee.

There are those who are pleased at this cringing servility, this prostration before a quarter. It gratifies them to be able for a brief season to patronize a fellow-creature, to play the lord and the grandee. They would not care a stiver whether the practice tended to keep the servant in a state of partial servitude or not. They are pleased by the servitude, if themselves are the object of it. But hardly a more degrading spectacle can be seen than such a show of attention, such a meretricious promptness and facility, such fawning, and all for a coin that once pocketed wipes out the whole score. Then there are those who will always give fees and tips because by this means they can get more than they pay for by collusion with the object of the fee. The attendant at the play will find a good seat for a fee that, added to the admission, will not equal the box-office charges, or the waiter will, on a generous fee, furnish dishes that are exceptional. Then, lastly, there are those too timid to resist the insolence of the servants, and yield to them for the sake of peace. All these conspire to keep the servant in a condition of servitude, and postpone the time when domestic and public service will be on the same level of business honor as is the case with the trades generally. Every man has a right to self-respect, and those who would advocate paying a charge that would allow the servant his rightful due, refusing anything more, are those who help that servant to gain that self-respect.

J. T.

NEW YORK.

THE INVINCIBLES AND HOME RULE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: Mr. W. J. Linton, in your number of the 8th inst., refers to the acceptance by the Parnell Parliamentarians of Mr. Gladstone's measure, and continues:

"May it be pertinent to ask whether the American Irish (or Irish-Americans, whichever is the correct term) and the Fenians and the 'Invincibles' would in good faith accept the same? If not, how are they to be dealt with? Will some Irish friend make answer?"

The acceptance or non-acceptance of Mr. Gladstone's or any other scheme of settlement by the "Invincibles," or by any party desiring entire separation between Great Britain and Ireland, is of no account. The question we have to ask ourselves is, whether the present system or a reasonable settlement, acceptable to constitutional politicians, would tend most to a real union between the islands. From this point of view, the Invincibles will scarcely be so foolish as to help on any modification of the present "Union."

Yours very truly,

ALFRED WEBB.

DUBLIN, July 23, 1886.

NOS MUTAMUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: The earth revolves, and human opinions revolve in a precisely similar manner—never returning to exactly the same place, but now nearer, now further from the Light which rules them: the epochs of optimism and pessimism are the alternating summer and winter of the ages. These moral seasons, that endure for more than a generation, induce large diversities in human intelligence; and as virtue is of one quality at the tropics and of quite another at the poles, so does the mind of 1800 judge quite differently of things from that of 1700 or of 1900. The sage asks with more interest what posterity will think than what the world has thought, far less answerable though the question be; and meantime amuses himself with observing how widely wise men may differ. The sage who now addresses you has within the hour been edified in this manner by comparing the views recently expressed by Mr. Max Müller on the subject of Goethe's patriotism, with those to which De Quincey gave utterance, writing on the same topic thirty years ago and more. The generation that has just passed off the stage and that which is upon it are fairly enough represented on this point by these two views. Which of them will seem most reasonable to the advancing generation?

It is in his sketch of Coleridge that De Quincey speaks of Goethe.

"It is a singular anecdote," he says, "it is a singular anecdote [sic] to report of Coleridge that in any eminent sense he was not a patriot. His understanding in this, as in many instances, was too active, too restless, for any abiding feelings to lay hold of him. In this instance he had the same defect, derived in part from the same cause, as a contemporary more celebrated than Coleridge, but far his inferior in power and compass of intellect. I speak of Goethe: he also was defective, and defective under far stronger provocation and excitement, in patriotic feeling. He cared little for Weimar, and less for Germany. And he was, thus far, much below Coleridge, that the passion which he could not feel, Coleridge yet obliged himself practically to obey in all things which concerned the world; whereas Goethe disowned this passion equally in his acts, his words, and his writings."

Mr. Max Müller, in inaugurating the English Goethe Society the other day, confined his remarks to one only of the "ideals" of Goethe, "one which he cherished with intense devotion. . . . I mean his cosmopolitan sympathies." Behold the stumbling-block of offence become the corner-stone of the temple—the "defect" metamorphosed into "the gigantic stature of Goethe." Mr. Max Müller admits that for these "cosmopolitan sympathies" and "his want of national

sentiment" "his own countrymen have often rather blamed than praised him, . . . most unjustly, I think," he adds—

"for when the time of trial came, he proved himself as good a patriot as many who tried to be more eloquent than Goethe in their patriotic songs and sermons. Goethe . . . was thoroughly true. He was too great to dissemble. He could not pretend to be a patriot in the sense in which Arndt, Jahn, and Schill were patriots. 'I should have been miserable,' he says, 'if I had made up my mind ever to dissemble or lie. But as I was strong enough to show myself exactly as I was and as I felt, I was considered proud.' O that we had more of that pride, and less of the miserable pretence of unreal sentiment. National sentiment is right and good, but we must not forget that national sentiment is a limited and limiting sentiment, particularly to a mind of such universal grasp as Goethe."

Neither Mr. Max Müller nor Mr. De Quincey would be called the wisest of men, but they are very instructive to

A SAGE.

Notes.

MR. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, JR., has consented to write the life of the late Richard H. Dana, jr., and desires to obtain any letters written by Mr. Dana that are not strictly private and might be of use for the biography. If sent to Mr. R. H. Dana, No. 30 Court Street, Boston, they will be copied and returned.

Edward L. Osgood, No. 60 Congress Street, Boston, is about to deliver to subscribers the 'Memorial History of Hartford County, Conn.,' of which Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull has had the editorial direction. It is a sumptuous work, in two large volumes, freely illustrated.

Harper & Brothers will shortly publish 'The Children of Old Park's Tavern,' a tale of the South Shore of Massachusetts fifty years ago, by Mrs. Frances A. Humphrey; and 'Love and Luck,' by R. B. Roosevelt.

'Thoughts,' by Joseph Roux, a French parish priest, is in the press of T. Y. Crowell & Co.

'Hannibal of New York' is the title of Mr. Thomas Wharton's new novel, which Henry Holt & Co. will shortly bring out.

A. M. Bridgman & Co., Boston, announce 'The Labor Movement: The Problem of To-day,' edited by George E. McNeill, a prominent Knight of Labor, with the aid of other Knights, from Mr. Powderly down. The work will be sold only by subscription.

The Essex Institute, Salem, Mass., is to erect a new building adjoining its present quarters, for its exclusive occupation. The sum appropriated is modest, and it is to be hoped that the friends of this useful institution will respond to its appeal for contributions by which the burden may be made easy. These may be sent to Mr. George D. Phippen, Treasurer, Daland House Fund, Salem.

An American *Journal of Morphology*, devoted principally to embryological, anatomical, and histological subjects treated originally and at first hand, is to be published early in 1887 by Ginn & Co., Boston. The editor is Mr. C. O. Whitman, now of Milwaukee, Wis., formerly of the Agassiz Museum at Cambridge. Two numbers will be issued yearly, with plates executed in the best manner of lithography. The subscription price is \$6.00.

Palgrave's 'Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics' (Macmillan) now takes its proper place among educational text-books by reason of the cheap price at which it can be furnished, neatly bound in cloth. The fifty cents spent upon this book will do more to cultivate the taste of scholars than ten times the amount invested in most of the current grammars, readers, and manuals of English literature. No public school should be without it.

A second, revised, edition of Mr. Louis Heilprin's 'Historical Reference Book' (D. Appleton & Co.) has just appeared, marking the well-earned success of this admirable work—a dictionary of dates, a dictionary of events (with a special gazetteer for the places mentioned), and a concise biographical dictionary, all in one, and all in the highest degree trustworthy. Mr. Heilprin's revision is as thorough as his original work. Any one can test it by running over the list of persons deceased since this manual first appeared. Corrections, too, have been made, as we can testify in one instance at least.

'Quaint and Curious Advertisements,' in Mr. Henry M. Brooks's "Olden Time Series" (Ticknor & Co.), is one of the best of the issues up to this date. Naturally, also, it is the most profusely and amusingly illustrated. A realm which the dictionary-makers only imperfectly invade is here glimpsed in long lists of obsolete names of cloths and stuffs, from kenting handkerchiefs to Aleabad mowsannas. Henry Knox, bookseller at Cornhill, Boston, and about to exchange letters for arms, fiftly advertises Dodd's 'Reflections on Death' in 1774. Paul Revere advertises himself a dentist "who learnt the Method of fixing" false teeth from a Mr. John Baker. Dentistry descended through the Flagg family in Boston, and here is one of them ready to pay cash "for live teeth." Here, too, is Whipple, of a line of booksellers, and Hook, of music-sellers and organ-makers. Benjamin Russell, paper-hanger, is on the north side of "Bacon" Hill; while on the western slope the Boston Cent Society is called to hold its annual meeting at the house of the mother of Wendell Phillips. There was a Shaksperian (*sic*) Society in Boston in 1795, with freshly revised articles. That there is nothing new under the sun we are reminded by the cuts of the Draixena, the forerunner of the bicycle, and of a fountain-pen quite like the stylograph.

'The Shaksperian Referee,' by J. H. Siddons (Washington: W. H. Lowdermilk & Co.), is a dictionary of 4,200 words and phrases which may need explanation in Shakspeare. The volume is small and handy, and would be of use to school libraries. Unfortunately it did not receive the author's final correction, on which account the publishers ask for consideration; but, so far as we observe, it is adequate to its purpose, though the long notes might be profitably abridged, as they contain much irrelevant matter and occasionally weak commentary quite outside the general object of the work.

The latest number of the *Bibliographical Contributions* of the Library of Harvard University consists of a classified index to the maps in the Royal Geographical Society's publications, prepared by Richard Bliss, of the Redwood Library, Newport, R. I.

We receive from Dietrich Reimer, Berlin, a fourth revised edition of Richard Kiepert's map of the Congo basin, the scale of which is 1:4,000,000. As its value in this country will be rather for the student than for the trader, we will add that it shows in appropriate colors the tracks of explorers, including those of the German expedition of 1884-86. The latter will also be found delineated (1:3,000,000, in the Proceedings of the Berlin Geographical Society (Vol. 13, No. 6). Herr Wolff, a member of the expedition, has discovered a cut-off for the Stanley Falls, viz., the easily navigable River Kassai and a northern tributary, which promise to be the highway to Nyangwe, Lake Tanganyika, and the east coast.

Dr. H. Kiepert has prepared a beautiful map of Asiatic Turkey, in order to show the condition of road-building in that ill-governed country. There are plenty of routes shown, but very few of these are thoroughly constructed, and it has often happened that Turkish attempts to build have ended in leaving the roads worse than be-

fore, and, in fact, absolutely impassable. The railroad system is extremely limited, in spite of the great scheme for connecting Constantinople with the Persian Gulf. There is an "Imperial Ottoman Railway" network, of no great magnitude, running out from Smyrna, and there is a line completed from Mersina to Tarsus, and about to be opened to Adana. Kiepert's map (which accompanies No. 123 of the Berlin Geographical Society's *Zeitschrift*) will be useful to scientific travellers in Asia Minor and Syria.

Science for July 30 prints another series of composite portraits, drawn from the students of Smith College. Prof. John T. Stoddard, who made them, accompanies the prints with some helpful remarks on the difficulties of this interesting process, and on the rules to be observed in making the negatives. The type portrait of forty-nine young ladies of the last senior class would be regarded in the flesh as a very attractive person; and very striking as well as attractive is the type of the ten who formed the division in physics. These portraits must be thought to speak well for the class of students who seek their education at Smith College.

Mr. Clarence Cook's art journal, the *Studio*, makes in the July number its first essay in process-engraving, giving several plates after American paintings and a well-conceived "elephant pitcher." Mr. Cook promises to persevere until he can rival the European facility in the use of this invaluable adjunct.

L'Art (Macmillan) closes its fortieth volume with No. 530, and with the first number in July begins vol. xli. An article, in depreciation of Hobbema, by M. Émile Michel, is divided between these issues. M. Eugène Müntz hazards a conjecture as to the original of a portrait study in sanguine by Leonardo da Vinci, and puts it to the test by confronting on opposite pages an engraving after Raphael and a photographic copy of the sketch in question. The result is not convincing, but the comparison doubtless does injustice to M. Müntz's grounds for identifying the two. A study in sanguine after Greuze, and a striking etched character-portrait of the elder Coquelin, are among the best of the full-page illustrations.

Mr. Hamerton's newest chapters on "Imagination in Landscape Painting," in the *Portfolio* for July (Macmillan), have a literary charm out of the common, even for this most agreeable of all writers upon art; and they serve also to advance the argument. The accompanying select illustrations are all weighty. A very pleasing etching represents a boy and girl of the olden time dancing the Pavane. And excellent in its way is Amand Durand's reproduction of Marc Antonio's engraving of Raphael's "Jupiter and Cupid," among the frescoes of the Farnesina.

There is little to remark, for American or English readers, at least, in *Le Livre* for July. M. Charles Glinel makes it very clear that the elder Dumas had an early and a lasting ambition to be admitted to the Academy, contrary to the belief of M. d'Haussonville, as shown in his reception address to Dumas *fits*.

M. Émile Blavet, under the pseudonym of "Paris," has been writing in the *Figaro* vivacious little sketches, which he has published under their original title, 'La Vie Parisienne' (Paris: Ollendorff; Boston: Schoenhof). These, taken in small doses from day to day, lightly touching on current events, had all the charm of actuality; gathered together in a volume, they are like pressed flowers, which recall a pleasant memory to one who has seen them before when they had the fragrance of novelty.

M. Arsène Houssaye still continues to be prolific—not so much of new productions as of new books, which he makes by gathering together his former uncollected articles into volumes, for

which he always finds attractive titles. The last he has called 'Les Comédiens sans le savoir' (Paris: Librairie Illustrée; Boston: Schoenhof). It is made up of articles, some of them more than ten years old, others dated 1886. Whether M. Houssaye playfully writes of an Hôtel de Rambouillet in 1885, or whether he discusses woman's rights or gives his reminiscences of Félix Pyat, Jules Vallès, Victor Hugo, or Paul de Saint-Victor, he is always the same frivolous but charming writer, with just enough poetic feeling to add a show of grace to disagreeable details, and just enough worldliness to take off the bloom from everything he tries to speak of seriously.

M. Eugène Voizard devotes himself to the study of Montaigne with more fidelity than success. His last book invites attention from its size and apparently learned title, 'Étude sur la langue de Montaigne' (Paris: Léopold Cerf; Boston: Schoenhof). It is incomplete, incorrect, and misleading from beginning to end. The author has not even noted the corrections suggested to him by M. Delboulle in the *Revue Critique* in regard to blunders occurring in his 'Extraits de Montaigne,' blunders which are repeated and aggravated by the more ambitious and pretentious nature and form of the present work. It would evidently be unjust to apply to M. Voizard the epigraph which he complacently places on his title-page, though one is tempted to do so. It is taken from the *Essays*, Book I, ch. 48: "Me voicy devenu grammairien, moy qui n'apprins jamais langue que par routine, et qui ne sçait encore que c'est d'adjectif, conjonctif et d'ablatif."

Foreign phrases, when used mistakenly, should be nailed at once to the counter and not allowed to pass current for a moment. In a just-published volume, 'On Both Sides' (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.), which is not without good sense and humor, we find the following: Mr. Heathcote "had contracted a moral squint which showed itself in some ugly little ways, . . . and this, Jenny, with the *esprit de l'escalier* of the sex, had at once divined and resented." The usually accepted meaning of "*esprit de l'escalier*" (or, more commonly, *esprit d'escalier*) is the wit, the inspiration, that comes to one too late (on the stairway in leaving a salon): it is the thing one ought to have said, the "happy thought" one should have had.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 29 Bedford Street, Covent Garden, London, have arranged with the Autotype Company to reproduce in permanent form copies of twenty-five of Mr. W. J. Stillman's Athenian photographs. These will be sold to members at three shillings each, unmounted, and four and sixpence mounted; to the outside public at five shillings, and six and sixpence, respectively. Mr. Stillman himself can no longer supply them.

—Volume vii of Leslie Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) includes a number of illustrious names which are treated at length. Sir Thomas Browne, author of 'Religio Medici'; Mrs. Browning; Robert Bruce; James Bruce, the African explorer; Buckle; Bunyan; Burke; Bishop Burnet; and Robert Burns, are some of these. The Browns are very numerous in this volume, the last of the John Browns being the author of 'Rab,' and others of the name being Oliver Madox Brown, Rawdon Lubbock Brown, Robert Brown, the eminent botanist; H. K. Browne ("Phiz"), and one Robert Brown, painter, to whom is ascribed the presence of mind which, in the familiar story, saves his master from walking backwards off a scaffolding by flinging a brush of color at the apostle's head in the cupola of St. Paul's. Frank Buckland and his father (apparently the better scientist of the two) are also in the list, along with Agnes Bulmer (1775-1836), the author of probably the longest

work in verse ever achieved by any woman—one mark of distinction at least, considering that she had Mrs. Browning for a contemporary. Mr. Stephen himself writes the sketches of Buckle and of Burns, the latter not deficient in praise or sympathy, and crammed with details. Under Burke is cited his use of the Yankee doggerel,

"Solid men of Boston make no long potations";

and mention is made of Boston editions of his works, 1806-1827 and 1839; but none of the very best and latest, that published by Little, Brown & Co. in 1868, improving on a corresponding English edition. Just as Buckle's masterly chess-playing is brought out in the account of him, so the notice of Burgoyne revives many phases of his talent which are seldom, if ever, thought of in this country, such as his comedy-writing. Other personages in the present volume who have had American connections are Sir Henry Bulwer, of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty; Sir George Brown, wounded at Bladensburg; the elder Brunel, builder of the Thames tunnel; John Baldwin Buckstone, the actor, who wrote a preface to an English edition of Dr. Bellows's 'Claims of the Drama'; and William Bullock, traveller, and author of a 'Sketch of a Journey through the Western States of North America' (1827).

—On the 7th of July a statue of Lamartine was "inaugurated" at Passy—"a tardy homage to the greatest poet of this century," according to M. Jules Lemaitre; and three days after there is a discourse in the *Revue Bleue*, by M. Ernest Desjardins, on the two questions, "Why do we honor him to-day?" (*le plus grand poète de ce siècle*) and "Why have we so long forgotten him?" (*le plus grand poète de ce siècle*). M. Desjardins's discussion of this problem is not very profound, but the anecdotes with which he enlivens his pages are very amusing. The transports of enthusiasm which Lamartine excited from 1820 to 1850 or later, subdued his nature to that acceptance of it which is one with a naïf expectation of adoration from all comers. He once asked one of his friends to obtain for him a secretary. The friend sent him one, highly recommended, and a day or two after came to inquire concerning his protégé. "He pleased me," said Lamartine, "only—" "Only what, *cher maître*? Do you think him too young?" "No; his age is very good." "Too ugly?" "Oh, what do I care about his looks?" "Didn't he seem to you active?" "Oh, yes." "Intelligent?" "Yes, certainly, entirely irreproachable; only—" "Only?" "Only he didn't appear moved on seeing me." Lamartine could hardly help believing that he had really brought to the world some sort of good tidings, and that his poetry contained supernatural treasures. His niece used to declare wickedly that he had never been the least envious of Victor Hugo, or of Byron; that even he could not be of Homer. "There is only one person in the world of whom my uncle is a little jealous, and that is Jesus Christ." That was a disenchanted family view; there is something very pretty in the simplicity, on the other hand, of his mother's enchantment, when she said proudly of him as a youth, "Alphonse writes very well; if he would take pains, he could write verses like M. l'abbé Delille."

—It was Balzac, if we remember aright, who added to the divisions of society as they exist in France—*noblesse*, *bourgeois*, *peuple*—a fourth class, *artistes*. He might have added a fifth, *academiciens*, but that, having no expectation of becoming one himself, he preferred to ignore their importance. Another reason may have been that the Academy, outside the small body of professional men of letters, has so little hold upon the imagination. But in Germany the relative importance of classes is reversed. French "artistes," to accept their own opinion, are beings

who have developed, from a bourgeois environment, into more or less resplendent butterflies, and are regarded by their neighbors with the hatred of envy or the contempt of ignorance, since, to them, genius means want of common-sense, and intellectual superiority is equivalent merely to eccentricity. Now, it cannot be said that individuals who answer to this description are never found in Germany; but as a class they are not sharply enough defined from the middle class to form a social variety of species. Their peculiarities are less marked. On the other hand, the professors, corresponding to the academicians, have had everything their own way. They are a comparatively numerous body, and share in the halo which adorns all functionaries under a bureaucratic régime; while, at the same time, they formed the only articulate body which could and did, however feebly, protest against official tyranny and bureaucratic meddlesomeness. Hence their importance in a period of confusion like 1848. Directly or by proxy they controlled the Frankfurt Parliament, and to the predominance of their ideas its failure is largely to be ascribed. But while in politics their influence was never sufficient seriously to threaten the established order, in literature their sway has been undisputed. Lessing and Goethe, indeed, were not professors; were not even greatly admired by the professors of their time. But, once dead, the professorial world adopted them—took them, in fact, as standard-bearers. But the professors' reign is over; their doom is announced, with lamentations, and after having been blinked as long as possible, in their own organ, the *Deutsche Rundschau*. As "Figaro" precipitated 1789, so 'Die Familie Buchholz' has been the lightning which has revealed the tottering state of the old régime in literature.

—Julius Stinde, the author of this "epoch-making" work, had written several tales, said to be very good, but which had brought him neither fame nor fortune, when he made his ten-strike in the publication of 'Die Familie Buchholz.' The first volume of the book is now in its thirty-seventh edition, while the second is in its twenty-ninth, and there seems no reason to doubt that this (for Germany) fabulous degree of popularity is due to its merits, and not to such adventitious circumstances as Prince Bismarck's advertisement of it. But it appears to have been this, combined with the attention the book received abroad, which forced the professors to take cognizance of its existence. Bismarck seems to have regarded it only as a remarkably amusing novel, but the professors, we may suppose, never read novels as such; it is only when these assume the shape of a social phenomenon or sign of the times, like 'Werther' or the present work, that their attention can be secured. But how, one may ask, can the adventures and opinions of a commonplace middle-class family, however humorously described, be deemed so dangerous to the intellectual foundations of society? It is because in this life, in these characters and their opinions, the soon-to-be dominant class of society recognizes itself, and applauds accordingly. "In this book they find, described with exhaustive accuracy, everything that concerns them in life, God and the world, government and society, marriage, family, birth, and death"; and the sum and substance of all, according to our critic, is that they neither believe nor disbelieve in anything, value everything for its practical advantage solely, and admire nothing except in so far as it contributes to their amusement. "It is not because of the clever things which she says that Wilhelmine Buchholz is popular; it is because she says what others long have thought, but have not dared to utter. The passport given to this

fictional character has become available for an entire class. One need no longer abstain from doing anything that she does, nor does one run any danger in indicating one's adherence to her view of life. The tongue of the *Spießbürgerthum* has been loosed!" Let not the reader suppose, however, that these views are anarchical or communistic, or are otherwise what are generally deemed hostile to society. The most dangerous opinions here mentioned, as held by people "who know neither Latin nor Greek," are that these languages must be thrown overboard, that their education is sufficient, and that the distinction between higher and middle-class culture must be done away with. And the worst is, that "sooner or later they will have their way" in this matter, will degrade the schools "as they already have degraded music and the drama," and be as omnipotent in this field as they are in (liberal) politics. Hitherto, remarks the critic, "literature has represented the class which has ruled in politics and in society. Even those authors who did not belong to this class pretended to do so, and, in writing for a social stratum below this, made plain their condescension." The object of all was "to raise the reader to the height of the writer, to push out of sight the trivial conception of the actual. . . . It never occurred to them to allow the chorus to address the audience; to accept the popular view of anything, because no one was willing to acknowledge that he belonged to the chorus, let alone adopting its views!" But, alas! this happy period is over: already, "even among so-called cultivated people, one hears ten popular phrases to one classical allusion," while "Bräsig and Wilhelmine Buchholz are quoted far oftener than 'Faust,' or 'Tasso,' or 'Wallenstein.'"

—In our obituary notice of Leopold von Ranke we stated that "Giesebrecht, Sybel, Duncker, and Waitz (who died a few days after him) may be mentioned as his foremost followers." Two months have scarcely elapsed, and already another member of this small group of eminent historians, Max Duncker, follows the master into the grave. Sixteen years younger than Ranke, Duncker attained the age of seventy-four years and nine months, having been born in October, 1811. Waitz was born in 1813, Giesebrecht in 1814, Sybel in 1817. The two youngest survive. A politician and state-archivist—Duncker is known by fewer and probably less lasting productions than either of the other mentioned workers in the field of history; but his *Geschichte des Alterthums* has made him the favorite of a vast circle of cultivated readers. It embraces only the earliest periods of universal history, being devoted chiefly to Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, the Hebrews and Phœnicians, India, Media and Persia, and Hellenic origins; but it has the rare merit of combining fulness of detail with clearness and elegance, and a minute acquaintance with the latest results of archaeological research with critical independence of judgment. To a whole generation of German scholarly readers, in fact, Duncker has been a trustworthy and indefatigably self-improving guide through the mazes of newly unearthed remains and gradually reconstructed antiquities. Every new issue of his *History of Antiquity* has been a partial renovation of it, keeping pace with the growth of historical exploration. The first edition was published in four volumes in 1852-7; the fifth edition (of which there is an English translation) was finished with the seventh volume in 1883; the first volume of a "new series" appeared in 1884.

—Alexander Nikolayevitch Ostrovski, after Gogol the most popular dramatist of Russia, died of apoplexy in the middle of June, at the age of about

sixty-six. Shortly before his death he had been appointed superintendent of the leading stage in Moscow. It was the sketching of the narrow bourgeois life, with its austerity, rigid prejudices, and domestic tyranny, as it prevailed in that old capital and the provinces of which it is the centre, that gave the chief color to his numerous productions, and rendered them popularly attractive, but by dint of repetition also monotonous, and collectively tedious. One of his dramas of that class had to wait more than ten years for admission to the stage, as the censorship thought the corps of Moscow merchants was too severely handled in it. He wrote with great rapidity, and precipitation marks and mars also the development of his plots. Of his plays "Lucrative Employment," "Poverty is No Vice," and "The Storm," belong to the more successful. The last-named, a pathetic piece, is perhaps his most poetic production. Ostrovski cultivated also the historical drama with varied success, several of his serious plays, such as "Kozma Minin" and "Pseudo-Dimitri and Vasil Shuiski," referring to the "troubled period" of usurpation, invasion, and revolt in which Boris Godunoff, Pseudo-Demetrius, and Basil Shuiski successively acted bloody and tragic royal parts, until deliverance came through the popular heroes, Minin and Pozharski, and the Romanoffs (in 1613) were called to the throne.

SEWALL'S LETTER-BOOK.

Letter-Book of Samuel Sewall. Vol. 1. 1686-1712. [Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Vol. 1.—Sixth Series.] Boston: Published by the Society. 1886. 8vo.

THE impression of Sewall's worth derived from his Diary will not be weakened, but rather strengthened, by the printing of his Letter-Book by the Massachusetts Historical Society, to whom it belongs. We hasten to add that if any one opens this volume with any expectation of finding graphic pictures of the every-day life of our ancestors, bits of news and current scandal, discussion of topics of general interest, criticisms of books, important political revelations, light on obscure genealogical or historical points, or even the mere pourings of a generously stored mind, he will be greatly disappointed. Sewall, if these letters are a fair specimen of his ability, will never be ranked among the great letter-writers, either for his style or for bright sketches of character and life. He writes a clear, straightforward letter, about whose meaning there can be no doubt, oftentimes expressing himself in very excellent terse English, with now and then a quaint expression and an occasional faint glimmer of humor. As mere letters, however, they are not worthy of publication. But if one wishes to know something about the life of a busy man two hundred years ago, his interests, his hopes, his gains and losses, his methods of transacting business, his habits of thought, he will find much to interest him in this volume. And if he be a merchant, or familiar with the details of a mercantile life, after reading some of these letters he will have, we fancy, a greater respect for the enterprise of the men who, from the very humblest beginnings, laid the foundations of our commerce.

The first entries in this Letter-Book were made in 1686, though sundry documents of an earlier date were copied into it. It served, in fact, in a slight degree, as a commonplace book, as Sewall inserted a few letters by other persons, with papers, facts, and quotations of special interest to himself. About half of the letters appear to be given in full; the remainder are simply short memoranda of letters written. Occasionally there are repetitions of letters which have been lost at sea or captured by the French.

The period covered is that between the years 1686 and 1712, the most important and active part of Sewall's life. A second volume is promised by the editors, giving the letters of his later years, as well as others, possibly, collected from various sources. To a limited degree they supplement the Diary, and at times throw light upon some of its obscurities.

The earlier letters relate very largely to business matters. Sewall originally intended to be a minister and studied divinity with that end in view; but his marriage with the rich John Hull's daughter, Hannah, led him to give up this intention, and, until he was forty years old, when he became judge, his chief employment seemed to be the care of his property, which was very considerable for those days. This implied in his case more than the mere cultivation of land and the collection of rents. He was a merchant also, although we are not aware that he actually had a store or a counting-room. Like most of the leading men of the colony, he was a ship-owner, and sent to the West Indies, England, and Spain cargoes of oil, fish (chiefly mackerel and cod), tar, molasses, etc., receiving in return a great variety of articles, but mainly cloths and books. Most of these things were imported for his own use, but many were bought apparently on commission for his correspondents. When the consignments were sufficient, the goods were paid for in this way. But when this was not the case, payment had to be otherwise provided for. Bills of exchange were used but infrequently, as they were very expensive. The following extract from a letter to London dated Aug. 1, 1691, is worthy of record as giving values at that time. Received "Fifty pounds in pss. 8-8, at six shillings a piece, weighing 17 P. wt., and I have drawn on you to pay them the Money at 30. £. 3 cent, which sum is now given here for good Bills." Remittances of coin or silver and gold was the most common form. Sewall took with him to England in 1688 "eight hundred and one Ounces of silver, and seven ounces of Dust-Gold in two Bags." At another time he sent to a London merchant, for some books, "a little Linnen Purse marked with Ink J. L. The contents inclosed, and are Gold Four arabian pieces, One double pistoll, Two Single ditto, One Lewi dore, Five Guineas; One broad piece of Charles the first." At another time he sends "sixty-five ½ pieces of eight and one Skillet of fine silver, being Mexico pieces melted down, weighing in all one hundred ounces. Suppose you had best put off the pss. to some Merchant who for sake of the Coin may give 1d or 2d in an ounce the more for them. The skillet will be proper for a Goldsmith." Lovers of old plate will grieve over this method of settling accounts, to which Sewall more than once refers. Among his English consignments is a live racoon, and there is this ghastly memorandum: "Sent 4 Ind. Scalps in Barrals mark'd with Ink S. S. one to Mr. Charles Morton, another to Mr. Mather, if acceptable." Occasionally goods are consigned to him from England to sell on commission. Various trusts, involving considerable estates, were also placed in his hands, and many of his letters relate to these, while a large number are to his tenants or agents in different parts of New England.

Sewall's references to political and current events are comparatively few and unimportant. There are but two very brief allusions to the witchcraft trials, a subject upon which he was very reticent, also, if we are not mistaken, in his Diary. These memoranda in letters to England in July and October, 1692, are all: "Are perplexed at witchcrafts; six persons have already been condemned and executed at Salem. 'Tis a very dry Time"; and I "desire your Prayers for us relating to the Witchcraft." To Nathaniel Higginson in London he writes an elaborate de-

fence of his action in refusing in 1706 to grant a writ of habeas corpus for the release of Vetch and others, who had been put into prison by the General Court on the charge of illegal trading with the French and Indians. This was to be used in case he was impeached as was threatened. We are surprised that the editors have not made this trial—which involved Governor Dudley, also, and excited great interest both in the Province and in England, and was the occasion of several noted pamphlets—the subject of a note, as it is neither very fully nor clearly treated in the Diary or in Palfrey's History. Sewall also speaks once or twice of the wisdom of the reduction of Port Royal in Nova Scotia, and Canada, and copies a scheme of Vetch's for the conquest and settlement of Nova Scotia, which was partly carried out in 1710, though no successful efforts were made to colonize the country until 1749. But to the revolution in which the Andros Government was overthrown, there is not, we believe, even a single allusion, although there is little doubt that Sewall was in sympathy with the movement, and would have shared in the responsibility for it, had he not been absent in England at the time. The references to current events are chiefly confined to the notice of the deaths of members of his family and prominent persons.

His greatest pleasure in writing, however, is to discuss some religious question with a minister. The longest and most elaborate letter in the collection, which he sent to various persons, is one upon the interpretation of the Book of Revelation. On this he had evidently spent a great deal of time in thought and in the study of all who had written on this subject, with as barren results as they. Naturally America is to play a great part in the coming redemption, but it is a little surprising to find him hinting that the City of Mexico may be "the New Jerusalem." The most insignificant events are seized upon with confidence as the fulfilment of prophecies. He hears of the wretched Darien expedition, and "so soon as I was informed of it . . . I said within myself, Surely the Company of Scotland is the Sixth Angel" of Rev. ix. Sometimes there is a strange mixture of religious discussions with business. Writing to a correspondent in "Antego" in regard to the state of religion in that island, and his hopes that the Tree of Life will make the place "healthy," he says: "Pardon me, Sir, if after this I subjoin a Passage of a far Inferior nature and pray you to send so much Lignum Vitæ as may make two or three very fair Mortars and pestills if they are made of the same," and then frankly adds, "The mention of the tree above brought it to my mind which I thought not off before." Among the questions on which Sewall's advice was asked, as appears from this book, was as to the lawfulness of certain marriages. He argues in almost the same terms against the Scriptural propriety of a man's marrying the "Widow of your Cousin German" as the opponents of the "Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill" use to-day in England. It is directly contrary to the Levitical law and is consequently in part a casting off of the "Yoke of CHRIST." After this we are prepared to find him condemning in strong terms the marriage of the Rev. John Williams of Deerfield with his own cousin, and writing to a lady who wishes to know whether she may marry her dead husband's brother: "I apprehend it to be against the Law of England, against the Law of Nations (? Nature), and against the Law of GOD."

His interest in the Indians is great, and he advises that some of them should be educated to be ministers and teachers, and also recommends the modern system of reservations to show that we did not "grudge them a Living upon their own Earth." He has but little to say about Harvard College, although the earliest letter is one written

in 1672 to a classmate (hardly to Daniel Gookin, as the editors conjecture, who was of the Class of 1669, since he writes "Remember me kindly to all our Class"), which is interesting simply as showing the affected style, the pedantry and clumsy attempts at wit of a youth just out of college. Sewall evidently took some pride in it, from the fact that he copied it so many years later. In 1710 he writes a vigorous and sensible letter to President Leverett, condemning the practice of inserting "the Names of those in the Thesis, who are beyond Sea, and no expectation of their being present." This he styles "Faggotting," a word still used in a somewhat similar sense in Scotland. It is noteworthy that, while showing considerable interest in finding out the College and the year in which Blackstone, the founder of Boston, took his degree at Oxford, offering to pay the charge for the research, he shows none in relation to that which interests so many of our own day—the somewhat similar question in regard to John Harvard. He writes a letter of advice in regard to the establishment of a college in Connecticut, in which one of the principal items is, "Let the president be enjoined to read and Expound the Scripture in the Hall morning and Evening, *de die in diem*." Later he sends 'Pole's Synopsis Criticorum,' in five volumes, "for the use of your Collegiat School." As a specimen of his letters, we venture to give the following, addressed to the two schoolmasters of Boston:

"April 1, 1708. *Feria quinta*.
Gentn.—If stated anniversary days for solemn Religious exercises are unwarrantable: Without controversy, anniversary days for sinful vanities, are Damnable. If men are accountable for every idle word, what a Reckoning will they have, that keep up stated Times, to promote Lying and Folly! What an abuse is it of precious Time; what a Profanation! What an Affront to the Divine Bestower of it! I have heard a child of Six years old say within these 2 or 3 days; That one must tell a man his Shoes were unbuckled (when they were indeed buckled) and then he would stoop down to buckle them; and then he was an April Fool. Pray Gentlemen, if you think it convenient, as I hope you will, Insinuat into your Scholars, the defiling and provoking nature of such a Foolish practice; and take them off from it.
I am Gent'n your Serv't, S. S."

Good Master Cheever, no doubt, acted willingly on this suggestion of the honored Judge, who had probably been a sufferer by this "Foolish practice;" but, we fear, without success.

We have noted one or two quaint expressions, as for instance, in excusing himself to Higginson for intrusting his defence to him, Sewall says, "There is none in England I have eat so much Py in partnership with, as yourself; therefore I Trust you." A certain sick friend "is still confin'd to the prison of his Stamack." Referring to the fact that he would not follow the prevailing fashion in wearing a wig, he says, "The Truth is, a Great Person has furnished me with Perukes Gratis, these Two and Fifty years, and I can't yet find in my heart to goe to another." Twice he uses the expression "as long as the three stars continue to make the obtuse Angle in the Heavens, I am your assured friend."

The little vanities and weaknesses which are so apparent in his Diary, and which have been brought into such undue prominence by those who have written upon it, are not to be discovered here. In these letters Sewall shows himself to have been a shrewd, clear-headed man of business, venturesome and at the same time prudent. He was a just but not hard creditor, an indulgent landlord, a generous friend. To ministers in the country he was continually doing kind actions, writing to them, and sending the new books, pamphlets, and papers; about as much a boon to them in those days as a newspaper now to a traveller in Central Africa. Writing in a day when personal enmities and jealousies were very strong, from which Sewall himself suffered fre-

quently, as his Diary shows, there is not a hard or a bitter word to be found from the beginning to the end of his letters. And, perhaps stranger still, there is not a letter in which he solicits place or preferment of any kind for himself, though he was by no means without ambition. It is difficult for any one to understand what a remarkable fact this is if he is not familiar with the letters of such men as Dudley, Belcher, and others of that time, whose letters are full of personalities, and, if to men of influence, of fawning flatteries and solicitations for office. Sewall's character seems to have been of a higher type than the greater part of his contemporaries.

It is a mistaken notion that men in those early days led necessarily a narrow and confined life. This was true, no doubt, of the majority, but not of men of Sewall's stamp, whose business enterprises were considerable, bringing them into constant communication with different parts of the world. The continual wars gave them a keen interest in European politics, so that every ship that came, brought them abundant material to think and talk about. Then there were their brethren who were captives in Canada, Algiers, or "Salley," to be cared for and ransomed, the frontier towns to be provided for in time of danger; and finally the policy and designs of the French and the home government were an ever-fruitful subject of discussion. Sewall in addition had estates in many parts, of New England, over all of which he exercised a watchful care. It is not too much to say that he had more varied interests, and a mind more keenly intent on gaining knowledge, than most men of the present day.

It only remains to speak briefly of the editors' part in this work. They have very scrupulously followed the original manuscript, even to the printing of manifest errors and repetitions. In regard to the notes with which they have here and there elucidated the text, opinions will of course vary. Some will regard the information given often as trivial and unnecessary, and will wish that light had been thrown on other portions which have been passed over without annotation. While most of the notes are short, there are a few subjects, such as the Bellingham will case, the addresses of the colonies on King James's "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience," and the course of Andros in respect to land titles, which are treated very elaborately, and contain some new historical material. The editors say that they reserve their opinion as to the value of this publication as a contribution to American history for the second volume, and we must follow their example. There are a few minor criticisms which we are prompted to make, since the publications of this Society have a right to be regarded as a standard for works of a similar character. It would have been better, we think, and clearer, if Sewall's own notes, which are numerous, had been indented in the text instead of being put at the foot of the page. With the preliminary matter to the volume a list of the more important publications of the Society could easily have been given, and would have proved very helpful to the many students who consult these valuable Collections. An index of the letters, giving the names of the persons to whom they were addressed, ought to have been prepared for the purpose of ease of reference. It is a mistake, also, we think, not to put the subject of a book in some way upon the title-page. There is nothing in the book, except in the editors' "Prefatory Note," which tells the reader that this is volume i of Sewall's Letter-Book. It is well to have this information on the back of the book, but it should also be in some prominent position on the title-page.

GOGOL.

Les Âmes Mortes. Roman par Nicolas Gogol. Traduit du russe par Ernest Charrière. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1885. 2 vols., pp. 336 and 357.

Taras Bulba. By Nikolai Vasilievitch Gogol. Translated from the Russian by Isabel F. Hapgood. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1886. Pp. 295.

THE door of Russian literature that has been opened to us, as that of Germany was to our fathers, was but unlocked a little while ago, and at first it was only ajar, and allowed but one or another writer of the day to step out and make himself known in these our distant lands. But now it has been, or will soon be, thrown wide open; and if, because of the barrier of language, we are unable still quite to enter into the national life it would admit us to, yet not only the authors our contemporaries, but their predecessors, are rapidly making their way to us through the help of their French conveyances.

It behooves us, in welcoming them, to recognize intelligently their various personalities, their degrees of nobility, the merits and demerits of each; and, in so doing, to acquire the material for judging and criticising the conditions of this literature which has so surprised us by its qualities of power, passion, satire, delicacy, depth, sadness, and especially by its *originality*—its extraordinary force of nationality, its never-before-witnessed blending of the streams of thought derived from old social and political sources with those springing from new ones.

When Turgeneff has introduced us to Tolstoi, and Tolstoi to Dostoyevsky, and Dostoyevsky perhaps to Gontcharoff, we find ourselves glancing towards an older man behind this group, and we are told, "Ah! that is Gogol [Gogle, they call him], whom you must not fail to know." And then they tell us this—that he was born in 1810, and had the immense good fortune to be the grandchild of an old Cossack who excelled in story-telling; and that, as soon as the boy had sown his wild oats as an author, he recalled the impressions of his childhood, and before he was twenty-five he had given the permanence of a very remarkable literary form to the thrilling legends and admirable traditions of heroic exploits which his dead grandfather's remembered voice still narrated to him, or which he heard recounted at familiar firesides. His first important book was entitled 'Evenings at the Farm,' the second 'Taras Bulba'; the one it is said Turgeneff ranked as "masterly," the other as "a work of genius." Soon after the publication of the latter, the failing health of its author induced him to leave Russia and take up his abode in Italy. He there completed the work before us, 'Les Âmes Mortes,' and it was published—in two parts, with a year or two's interval—between 1841 and '43. Subsequently Gogol's illness took the form of a sort of insanity, and he died in 1852.

'Les Âmes Mortes,' can scarcely be called, like 'Taras Bulba,' a work of genius, but it is the work of a thoughtful mind, keen, vigorous, and fertile. It has not a touch of the large ancestral picturesqueness, the poetic reminiscential quality, which distinguishes Gogol's more romantic writings; it is no romance, no novel, no story even—it is *scènes de la vie russe*, like so many of its successors in Russian literature. It is the progenitor, on one side, of Turgeneff's 'Memoirs of a Sportsman,' and, in a sense, of Tolstoi's 'War and Peace.' The same intensity of patriotism in pain breathes through it; the same disgust, the same delight in Russia as she is; the same confidence, the same disheartenment in contemplating Russians as they are; the same seriousness and absence of light humor. It is not a romance, but a history—passages of a philosophical history

of Russia at the moment preceding the abolition of serfdom; a contemporary history, with an insignificant thread of fictitious personal narrative running through it; a poem, its author somewhat enigmatically calls it, but it is really history set forth in pictures, not in annals—history in the mould in which philosophy is cast in 'Wilhelm Meister'; and what Carlyle (in his preface to the first edition) said of that is not less true of this: "Of romance interest there is next to none. The characters are samples to judge of rather than persons to love and hate; the incidents are contrived for other objects than moving us."

"The hero is a milksop," Carlyle continues, "whom, with all his gifts, it takes an effort to avoid despising." Gogol's hero—Tchitchikoff—is no milksop, but "un coquin ambitieux," "un méchant drôle," whom, with all his gifts, and they are many, we are intended to despise. But he represented one of the types of the generation of his day, a type which was disappearing as Gogol wrote; and as a study of his generation and of the conditions which produced Tchitchikoffs in abundance, this book deserves serious attention. Its interest is not diminished by the monotonous bitterness and almost passionate irony of its dominant note—the bitterness and irony of a patriot; but it must be admitted that many pages are, from other causes, open to the charge of being irredeemably dull. When the satire, as too often, assumes a farcical tone, its gayety is not contagious, it has no heartiness. None the less, since the present cannot be understood—especially the present state of Russia—without a knowledge of the past, such veracious testimony as this about the past from an observer curiously minute is of high value, if it is so also from a literary point of view, in considering the greater works of Gogol's successors.

The very title of the book, 'Dead Souls,' is derived from social conditions no longer in existence, and needs explanation. The adult male-serfs of Russia were called "souls"; and those who died were "dead souls." The fortune of a landed proprietor was not estimated by his acres, but by his serfs, and he was taxed accordingly; but as the census was rarely made, it often befell him to pay for a long time for "dead souls." One is slow to understand that these "dead souls," weighing heavily to the disadvantage of their original masters, could bring such advantages to other owners as to induce the conception of the fraudulence of buying and selling them. But remembering that the title deeds of his serfs was a man's fortune, we can follow that fact to the result that these dead peasants could (in a fiction) be pledged as so much wealth. The national bank made this transaction seem easy; and the object in life of our hero at the time we are introduced to him is to acquire a sufficient number of "dead souls" to people fictitiously an imaginary tract in a distant province, and then to pledge this domain to the State for a large sum.

It is on his travels in search of "dead souls" that we accompany him, and thus are brought into contact with all manner and conditions of men and things. In the author's own words, we "see men, contemplate closely the motive power, the springs, the interlocking wheels, and the hidden working of that machine which is called the world, read in the book of life, and put ourselves in a position to control theories by facts, and to assure ourselves that we know something." The formlessness of this *cadre* is in harmony with the mutability of the principal personage. Tchitchikoff plays different parts in succession and alternation. Like the various *Sganarelles* of Molière, he is many men of one name. The lack of artistic desire for completeness of outline, of artistic love of harmony of color, which Gogol thus

evinces, throws light on the curious irregularities and excrescences in Tolstoi's work, and makes it appear that this marked tendency to produce effects by force of accumulation rather than of selection is, we may believe, to some degree a national, and not especially a personal, characteristic.

In an admirable study of Gogol, Mérimée, who was among the first to make our author known outside Russia, compares him to Rabelais, the immortal master of "narrateurs décausés," and adds: "The mind becomes wearied in reading these brilliant pages, where perhaps there is not a superfluous word, but of which it is not less true that perhaps large parts of the work might be suppressed without sensibly diminishing its merit. The art of selection among the innumerable facts that nature presents to us is, after all, much more difficult than that of observing them carefully and rendering them exactly."

It is only Turgeneff who, as yet, among the Russians, as far as we know, has possessed this special quality of a great artist; and even his art is not of the kind which presents us

"With pure form nakedly displayed
And all things absolutely made."

With all of them the *form*, like Truth, is ever

"Flexible, changeable, vague, and multiform, and doubtful."

The slow encumberedness of movement this produces makes the book an almost impossible one to quote from: any "passage" is pages and pages in length. But we can perhaps extricate this description of the "telega," which leads up to a comparison of Russia herself to the national equipage, and even these few words of our author will surely inspire interest in him:

"Thou hast not a very fine appearance, O telega; thou art not in thy configuration an object of art on which the glance lingers: dry wood, an axe, an adze, an active arm, and thou art built. There is not a peasant of Yaroslav who is not capable of this construction. The three horses are put to, and the man?—What man?—The man to drive.—Ah, but if you please, it's this same peasant.—Very well! let him draw on his high boots, then!—Are you jesting? He is not a German postillion, he has no high boots, and he even does without any foot-gear at all. He has all that is necessary—mittens on his hands, and a beard on his chin! Look at him: God knows on what he is balanced; he strikes up his song, he sets off, and it is a whirlwind. The spokes of the wheels are blended together, and seem a plain surface from the centre to the circumference; the road trembles at the approach of the impetuous nags; the foot-traveller stands aside, uttering a malediction which is only a cry of alarm; then he stares open-mouthed, but the cyclone has passed. It rushes, rushes, rushes on; and off there, far off, a cloud of dust ascends spirally, then melts into the air, is dissolved, and becomes a vast drapery, which sinks slantingly down the descending sides of the road. All has disappeared."

"Dost thou not resemble this, O Russia, O my beloved country? Dost thou not feel thyself swept toward the unknown, like the impetuous troika which nothing can keep pace with? Along thy course the road smokes, the bridges groan and thunder; everything is overpassed, distanced, overrun. The observer pauses, impressed with profoundest wonder. . . . What means this movement, the cause of universal terror? . . . O Russia, Russia! Whither speedest thou? Let thy voice be heard—answer! She answers not. . . ."

'Taras Bulba' has just been translated by Miss Hapgood from the Russian *immediately* (not through the French). Those who may read it, and it deserves a very large number of readers, are to be congratulated on the translation being made by so competent a hand. It has the high and unusual excellence of conveying to the reader, from the closeness of its rendering, a certain foreign element in the style as well as in the thought. The tale is of Cossack life 400 years ago; of the fierce, half-nomadic life of the Zaporozhian Setch—a life as remote from our knowledge as is this out-

landish name itself, but not remote from our sympathies when pictured with all the force of Gogol's vigorous imagination.

Carlyle and the Open Secret of his Life.
By Henry Larkin. Scribner & Welford.
1886.

MR. LARKIN, who was in the latter part of Carlyle's life his private secretary, has previously given the public some account of the unhappiness he witnessed. The present volume is less biographical than critical. It is an attempt to sustain a theory of Carlyle's hopes and purposes by an examination of his works, letters, and acts; and in connection with this some valuable comments are made upon the man and his books.

The "open secret" is that Carlyle was desirous of entering public life in some active capacity—to be, in fact, the Man of Might of his own time. His first stroke was to write 'Sartor Resartus,' not truly an original book, but a popularization of German literature, especially as it was developed in Richter and Goethe. To show that this was the conception and plan of the work, Mr. Larkin enters on a detailed and highly ingenious analysis of 'Sartor,' chapter by chapter, and we recommend his explanation of that enigmatic volume to those who are curious about literary origins. At the conclusion of that work he finds and lays stress on these words: "Our own private conjecture, now amounting almost to certainty, is that, safe-moored in some stillest obscurity, *not to lie always still*, Teufelsdröckh is actually in London." To London, it would seem, Carlyle had come in the faith that a new era was to begin, and with some hope of making a party of literary men to lead in it; but 'Sartor' fell dead, and instead of congenial spirits he only found a set of destructive thinkers, whom he had to teach what a revolution meant by writing the 'History of the French Revolution,' which he believed was the final act of a world-movement. Not to pull down, but to construct was the duty of the hour; and this lesson was the ulterior aim of that great prose epic. In 'Heroes and Hero-Worship,' in its turn, Mr. Larkin also discerns the appeal to men of letters to combine for a public purpose; but, after that time, Carlyle having set out by himself as a social reformer in 'Charism' and 'Past and Present,' and having got a new light upon the nature and ineradicable opposition of good and evil from his study of Cromwell, he gave up the men of letters and began making his appeal to captains of industry and statesmen.

It is here that the striking portion of the theory comes in. Sir Robert Peel, it is said, became Carlyle's hope. Their acquaintance is minutely traced. Froude's report that Carlyle said he thought of public life just before Peel died, is brought forward to indicate a disposition on Carlyle's part to be a Queen's member; and the publication of 'Latter-Day Pamphlets' at that very time, and their cessation when Peel suddenly died, owing to his fall from a horse, are skillfully used to add weight to the supposition that Carlyle was practically considering the matter. Finally it is added that the reason of Carlyle's attachment to Lady Ashburton was that she had guessed his ambition, brought him into acquaintance with Peel, and by her hospitality offered the only avenue open to him to meet the public men of the ruling class. This was the secret which he did not tell Mrs. Carlyle, and was his defence for keeping up a connection which gave her so much pain. The death of Sir Robert Peel put an end to Carlyle's hopes, though Mr. Larkin thinks there was some glimmer of the old purpose in his seeking Prince Albert, also on introductions from Lady Ashburton; but this soon flickered out.

Such is the "open secret," briefly stated; and

it must be granted that the advocate has made a plausible case, both by his marshalling of facts, by his extracts from the writings of Carlyle, and especially by the manner in which he brings out Carlyle's tone at critical points. Furthermore, the theory does explain the facts of the Ashburton alliance, and put them in reasonable relation to one another. It may be allowed, too, that Carlyle, like many men of thought, desired to be a man of action, to have a hand in affairs. He seems to have held, like most men of the closet, that what is ethically desirable in a nation would be politically feasible, if the right hand were at the helm and the right brain on the bridge. Mr. Larkin, however, goes much further than to suppose that political ambition was incidentally felt by Carlyle, or that he was at one time making ready to seek public office through Peel; he asserts that a thwarted ambition was Carlyle's trial through life—a gnawing, secret, passionate desire. Hence the death of Peel is repeatedly spoken of as a terrible and tragic blow to long-cherished hopes on the eve of their possible realization. In other words, Carlyle was thereafter a kind of Napoleon in exile, fretting a great spirit to slow death.

Mr. Larkin pleads with such vigor and persistency to this effect that it really requires some effort to remember that the whole theory is a matter of pure inference, inasmuch as neither Carlyle in his voluminous confessions, nor any reporter of his conversation, nor any near friend, has ever disclosed this "secret." He thinks, indeed, that Carlyle guarded it so jealously as to be made uncomfortable by the suspicion that he himself—the private secretary—had penetrated it. Lady Ashburton would seem to be the only person who could have told us this by authority. Under these circumstances, the reader will scrutinize the evidence more closely. Mr. Larkin lays great stress, for example, upon Carlyle's remark that he wrote "with quite other than literary aims"; but is this anything more than a veiled sneer at "polite literature," and an assertion that he meant to affect society, in a practical fashion, it is true, but yet only by the instrument of printed thought? There is certainly no necessary implication in that sentence that he was using literature as a means to enter public life so as to affect society by direct action as a man of affairs. Similarly, with a considerable portion of Mr. Larkin's argument, much depends on the alternative chosen, the stress allowed, and the tone assumed; it is not a conclusive, but a cumulative proof. And yet, after a most guarded reading, one cannot resist the impression that Mr. Larkin has divined a truth in regard to Carlyle, though formulating it too closely and rigidly, and overstating its relation to the other elements of his life.

Whether one accepts this characterization as "the real Carlyle" or not, he will find much else in the volume of interest. The analysis of 'Sartor Resartus' has already been referred to; not less valuable is the criticism of 'Cromwell,' especially in regard to the incident of the refusal of the royal title, in which Mr. Larkin holds that Carlyle showed incapacity to understand the simplicity of the Protector's character. The division of Carlyle's literary life into the two periods of Goethe's influence and of the ascendancy of those later ideas which were developed in the study of Cromwell, is well marked off; and at the conclusion there is an admirably frank examination of Carlyle's dealing with his wife's inheritance, which sets his obtuseness and household economy in a very strong light, not at all to his honor. One observes, too, throughout the volume, the singular combination, so frequently to be seen in the minds of Englishmen who are neither Tories nor Liberals, of the idea of the English Federation with a mingled distrust and hatred of the

democratic spirit through which alone such Federation is possible. The book, we need hardly add, is essential to the student of Carlyle.

The Centennial History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York, 1785-1885. Edited by James Grant Wilson. D. Appleton & Co. 1886.

THIS handsome volume of 454 pp. octavo is published by the Diocese of New York and edited by one of a committee appointed in Convention for its publication. Gen. Wilson's work has been done with affectionate assiduity and carefulness. The volume is enriched with portraits of the several bishops, all steel engravings with one exception—a superb wood engraving of Bishop Potter, engraved by Johnson after a painting by Huntington. There are a few other engravings: an interesting one of old Trinity Church and a very ineffectual one of the present building, with a highly conventionalized vehicle going down Broadway, and three persons on the sidewalk equally conventional—an *entourage* as unlike the actual as could well be.

The reading-matter of the volume consists of an account of the dual celebration of the centennial anniversary of the first Diocesan Convention of New York, followed by lives of the successive bishops of the diocese and by historical accounts of the several parishes of the diocese as at present constituted. The celebration was held simultaneously in Trinity Church and in St. Thomas's. At Trinity Church the centennial sermon was by Dr. William J. Seabury—appropriately so, he being the great-grandson of the first American bishop, Seabury of Connecticut, and the fifth in direct line of descent ministering to the Episcopal Church in America in one way or another since 1743. His sermon is an expression of gratitude for the practical wisdom that has marked the development of the Episcopal Church in this country. For the structure of the Church, its interplay of episcopal with clerical and lay powers, he makes no claim of New Testament or traditional authority. It came, he says, from the peculiar training and position of those who were called upon to organize the Church in the American States as a body distinct from the Church of England. What we miss in this sermon, as in the remainder of the volume, is any large enthusiasm for morality or for religion. The pride of church extension is the dominant chord. And equally we miss, in a succession of sermons, speeches, biographies, and parish histories, throughout which the sense is steadily apparent that the Episcopal Church is the Church of America, any suggestion that it has been in harmony with the development of our political institutions in their most critical periods. The Church, as such, was distinctly out of sympathy with the War for Independence. Provost was driven from his charge of Trinity by a Loyalist flock. In the anti-slavery conflict it was equally out of sympathy with the abolitionist and anti-slavery parties. The material good-fortune of its later years is mainly owing to its accessions of pro-slavery Christians during the civil war.

The historical address at St. Thomas's Church, by Dr. B. F. De Costa, is an exceedingly elaborate and minute piece of work, filling forty closely printed pages. We presume it was shorter in the delivery. Much briefer are Bishop Cox's and Bishop Doane's personal reminiscences. The effusive eloquence of the former is well spiced with dogmatism. He dwells for several pages on the reform of Bishop Hobart in the relations of the pulpit and the altar in the architecture and service of the Church. Before his time, when the priestly functions were going on, the congregation "heard a voice but saw no man." The speeches generally move in this circle of ideas;

and much of them, for one not used to the ecclesiastical jargon which the speakers use unconsciously, "subdued to what they work in like the dyer's hand," conveys a dubious impression.

The sketches of the bishops are the most interesting portion of the book. The devotion of Provoost to the Revolutionary party is all the more attractive because of its exceptional character. Driven from his parish, he took to botanizing while the war went on, but sometimes lent a hand to the defence of the imperilled neighborhood. It is evident that the early years of the present century were years of weakness and contempt for the Episcopal Church in the United States. Provoost did not expect it to outlast the colonial generation, and his successor's ineffectual labors are but thinly disguised by the phrases of his eulogistic co-religionists. With Bishop Hobart there was a much better order of affairs. His successor, Onderdonk, was suspended from his office, the last seventeen years of his life, for lascivious conduct. He is treated very tenderly by his biographer, but the traditional leniency of ecclesiastics in dealing with offences in their order makes an appeal from the stern judgment of his fellow-bishops difficult to sustain. The bishopric was without a head for several years after Bishop Onderdonk's suspension; from 1852 to 1854 Dr. Wainright was provisional Bishop, and Bishop Potter, succeeding him as provisional Bishop, entered into the fulness of his office when Bishop Onderdonk died in 1861. The fact that Bishop Potter is still living tempers the praise of his biographer, but it is evident that the bishopric has never had another man of temper and ability so well adapted to the place. Liberal in his constructions, of conciliatory spirit, with a blind eye for things he doesn't care to see, steadily resolved to make the Church an instrument of social elevation, he deserves the love and admiration which is accorded him wherever he is heard or known, and he is fortunate in the assistant who has, for several years relieved him of his more arduous duties.

The parish histories vary in length from several pages to a few lines, and are confined to the most salient facts. The number does not represent the growth of the original bishopric from which the bishopric of Western New York was detached in 1835, that of Central New York in 1863, and still later the bishoprics of Albany and Long Island. Following the parish histories there is a long chapter on Institutions of Charity and Learning, which is a remarkable exhibit. A concluding chapter on the literature of the century is equally remarkable, but in another way—for the paucity of the results. It is evident that the strength of the diocese has gone into church extension and consolidation, and into works of charity, rather than into critical or speculative theology.

The Cruise of Her Majesty's Ship "Bacchante," 1879-1882. Compiled from the private journals, letters, and note-books of Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales, with additions, by John N. Dalton. Vol. i.—The West and the South. Vol. ii.—The East. Macmillan & Co. 8vo, pp. 675, 803.

THE only break in this three years' narrative is made by the division into volumes. The diary flows on with the continuity of a river, and, but for an occasional chart, even the voyages would be indistinguishable. These are, indeed, analyzed in the table of contents, but with no diversity in the captions. "At Sea" covers the run from Trinidad to Grenada, from Port Jackson to Moreton Bay, from Corfu to Palermo, etc. The worthy chaplain's sins against the art of book-making culminate in his failure to provide an index. This is a great pity, because, while only the

most determined "loyalty" could regard his lubrications as readable; in the sense, for example, that Mrs. Brassey's accounts of her cruises are readable, these two hulking volumes have a certain value as a work of reference. The "additions" which Mr. Dalton has made, and which double the normal size of the diary, embrace practical advice to emigrants to Uruguay, a history of the Transvaal War, an exposition of Confucianism and of the religion of ancient Egypt, the whole round of Egyptian and Syrian antiquities, the Eastern Question, and a thousand other things. Particularly the condition of the British colonies is studied and set forth with useful statistics, and with ready counsel to British statesmen as to what to do to revive Jamaica, etc., etc. To digest all this information, our royal middies would need another voyage round the world in the company of these volumes.

It cannot be said that the Rev. Mr. Dalton is a Jingo, though he has a pleasing faith in the British genius for governing, elevating, and blessing inferior peoples all over the globe, and clearly intimates a manifest destiny in the case of Egypt. He seems to be aware that his countrymen's dealings with the Chinese and the Zulus have not been quite moral, but in the case of the West Indies his view is antipathetic to the blacks; and he is far from having stated the facts about Gov. Eyre and the "insurrection" which he suppressed. At Martinique he remarks on the superiority in the condition of the French negroes over that of the same class in the English islands, attributing the difference to the fact that the French planters remained on their estates. He describes the contented and prosperous state of the Indian coolies in Trinidad, who have done wonders in opening up that beautiful island. Why the banana, which he calls "a devil's agent," has not wrought the same mischief with them as with the blacks, he does not attempt to explain. "The much-abused cocoanut," he says, "cannot come near it" in this vicarious capacity.

"The cocoa-palm is confined to the tropics and sea levels, and asks some labor, though not much. The banana grows as a weed, and hangs down its branches of ripe, tempting fruit into your lap as you lie in its cool shade. The cocoanut has a hundred uses, and urges man to work to make spirit from its juice; ropes, clothes, matting, bags from its fibre; oil from the pulp. It creates an export trade which appeals to almost all men in offering large and quick returns for little work. But the banana will make nothing: you can eat it raw or fried; you can eat it every day of your life without becoming tired of its taste, without suffering in your health; you can live on it exclusively. The plentiful possession of this tree has been fatal to industry and exertion for multitudes in the West Indies" (i, 176).

There is not much that is quotable in these pages—not so much as is really interesting. The princes have a British fondness for active exertion, sport, and athletics (every "bathe" is recorded), and very little sentiment. They are tattooed in Japan, and on the voyage thither join, at least as spectators, in shark-catching, when one of these fish "was blown to pieces with a disc of gun-cotton placed in a tin with a strip of pork wrapped round it for a bait; when he took it, it was fired with a boat's battery, which blew his head off and he sank." This was good discipline for a Sepoy rebellion. On the Nile, Philæ seems to have touched the sensibilities of the lads, or of their tutor; but had all three been totally devoid of the aesthetic sense they could not have been more silent as to the impression made on them by the statues of Memnon. They left their princely mark on the Great Pyramid under their father's A. E., as Cook's tourists might have done. They heard of Garfield's assassination while at Melbourne, July 3, 1881; and of Longfellow's death at Jericho, "the scene of his blind Bartimeus," on April 8, 1882. In 1880 their curiosity as to home

politics caused this adventure, one of the few humors of the cruise:

"April 29th.— . . . In the afternoon exchanged numbers with two English barques. To each of these we make a signal, 'Who is the Premier?' being anxious for news as to change of Ministry in consequence of the late elections in England; but neither of them make any response.

"April 30th.— . . . At 6.05 P. M. exchanged colors with an English barque, running to the westward, but cannot make out her number by signal; we alter course and close her, holding up a blackboard on the poop with, 'Who is the Premier?' chalked upon it. 'We are now within hailing distance of the barque, and her skipper, thinking we are inquiring her name, shouts out, 'Fanchon,' which our captain and those around him on the poop hear as 'Gladstone.' So they next hail to the old gentleman, 'What is his majority?' and the old man replied, 'Non entiendo' (meaning, I don't understand), which those on our poop understand as being 'One hundred.'"

Typographically, these volumes leave nothing to be desired, and the numerous illustrations are very good and serviceable.

The Journal of William Dowling. A new edition, with an Introduction, Notes, etc., by the Rev. C. H. Evelyn White. Ipswich: Pawsey & Hayes, the Ancient House. MDCCCLXXXV.

WELL-NIGH unique in its infamy stands the memory of the fatuous fanatic who, in the days of the Commonwealth, swept like a pestilence through East Anglia, laying his foul hands on relics of idolatry, as he regarded the venerated objects of his spoliation and destruction. Of what the man held to be alone compatible, as to externals, with genuine religion, it would be curious if we could recover his ultra-puritanic definition. One sacred edifice was, in his designation, "the church, so called"; and another and another, "the church, as it is called." A cross on a font or on a steeple was to him an abomination beyond endurance; the letters I. H. S. he stigmatizes as "the Jesuit's badge"; in chancel-steps and rails he could see nothing but appurtenances of false worship. Organs, stained glass—unless merely exhibiting armorial bearings—and carved ends of seats were not to be tolerated by his peculiar Christianity. In one church he ordered a painting of the sun and moon to be taken down; in another, he removed "Moses with a rod, and Aaron with a mitre"; and, from still another, "Adam and Eve" suffered summary ejection. One can hardly object to his having done away with a pictorial representation, in the church at Haverhill, of "seven Fryars hugging a Nunn," provided he actually found such a thing there. Especially conspicuous was his vandalism at Bures, where, he reports, "we brake down about 600 superstitious pictures"; at Bramford, where he destroyed 841 embellishments similarly characterized; and, above all, at Clare, where the number of them reached a round thousand, if we are to take his words literally.

Of the personal history of Dowling little that is uncontroverted, his ravages apart, has been ascertained. It seems to be pretty well settled, however, that he was born at Laxfield, in Suffolk, in 1596, and that he was buried in the same parish in 1679; having accordingly arrived at an age of more than four-score years. In 1643 he was appointed Parliamentary Visitor of the Suffolk churches, by a commission emanating from the second Earl of Manchester, who bore in loyal circles the nickname of "a Manchester Shift"; a very different description of person from his father, the author of a devout little treatise, once of great repute and extensive currency, entitled 'Manchester al Mondo.'

Dowling was occupied in all fewer than fifty days, between January 6, 1643, and October 1, 1644, in his work of devastation. In that inter-

val he wrought more or less damage to a large number of churches, though only just upwards of a third of the Suffolk parishes are specified, in his Journal, as having attracted his pernicious attention. In all likelihood a good deal was left by him to his deputies, among whom Francis Jessup, of Beccles, went even beyond his principal in sacrilegious folly, as appears from an account of his doings at Gorleston, near Yarmouth. His recording that he "brake the popish inscription, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*," affords a measure of the miscreant's intelligence. At the same place "we did deface the font," he informs us; and he deemed worthy of abolition, as being "superstitious inscriptions," the words, *Jesu fili Dei miserere mei*.

Dowsing's Journal has been repeatedly printed; but, as copies of it had become difficult to procure, Mr. White was moved to bring out a new edition of it, to which he has prefixed and appended sundry additions. The matter by which he has supplemented it is of very inconsiderable value. It is to be regretted, indeed, that some one more competent did not forestall him in his undertaking. His literary skill is that of a school-boy. Of style he has the crudest of conceptions; and he is not only slovenly, as his very first page sufficiently evidences, but silly. A Mr. Dove being mentioned, he thinks good to comment on his name, as being hardly indicative of his character. If he had taken warning by what befell Southey for his feeble facetiousness about Francis Bugg, the Quaker, he would not have done amiss.

The Imperial Island: England's Chronicle in Stone. By James F. Hunnewell. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1886.

In 'The Imperial Island' Mr. Hunnewell has done for England, with some differences of detail, what he did for France in his 'Historical Monuments of France.' He has made a manual for the most important of the old buildings of England which is half-way between a handbook and a guide-book. He describes her architecture, from the Druidical and Roman remains to the Houses of Parliament and the Albert Memorial. This ample field he allots into four divisions—architecture, or building, before the Normans; mediæval church architecture; civil and military architecture in the Middle Ages; and the architecture of modern England, from Elizabeth's days to ours. These divisions he subdivides geographically, prefacing and accompanying them with historical and geographical commentaries, the whole illustrated by pretty full and very useful bibliographical notes. Thus Mr. Hunnewell carries his reader four times over England, pointing out at each tour a different set of buildings, with a connecting thread of historical reminiscence. This plan tends to clearness and easy following—we do not know that another would have been better—but it does not lend itself readily to the study of architectural development. The point of view, indeed, is that of the intelligent amateur and reader of history rather than of the architect or antiquary, and this, with a certain negligence of broad relations, gives the book a desultory character, which, indeed, it is hard to avoid in books of its kind.

Mr. Hunnewell has but little of the art of the showman. He is not particularly graphic, and does not care to expend himself on objects of popular curiosity. But he has a sense of the value and dignity of history, and has compiled with exemplary diligence a great mass of material freshened (as far as may be) by personal observation and recollection. It is notable that no adequate general survey of English architecture has yet been made from a technical point of view,

and, pending this, the amount of material here collected, though lacking in technical directness and precision, will have its permanent value; and it contains most, perhaps all, of what the intelligent reader or traveller will wish to know of its subject.

For the illustrations of the book there is not much to be said. They are photolithographs from prints of various dates, mostly ill-executed, with an effort to give them a factitious smartness by printing in brown ink. Many are from excellent originals, but as here presented do little credit either to their engravers or the publishers. The map of England, with the tinted boundaries of the counties intensified by photographing into obtrusive black ribbons, is simply atrocious.

Carlsbad and its Environs. By John Merry-lees. With a Medical Treatise on the Use of the Waters, by B. London, M. D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

THIS is the latest of several monographs which have for their subject the waters of Carlsbad, the most famous, efficacious, and frequented of the Austrian spas. The work is divided into two parts. The first describes the situation, climate, history, springs, and environment of Carlsbad, giving full practical hints as to hotels, lodgings, cafés, and amusements, not overlooking the topic of the promenades and longer excursions that may be taken in the neighborhood of this charming place. In the second part the accomplished Dr. London, one of the best known of the resident physicians of Carlsbad, gives a careful résumé of the properties, indications, and uses of these potent waters. This part of the work has special value, for it brings out clearly the all-important distinction between the intrinsic goodness of a mineral water, and its special adaptation to the particular invalid. The distinction is one which is constantly disregarded by the public, and which indeed can only be rightly drawn by the physician who has given special attention to the therapeutics of mineral springs. The failure to make it is, of course, serious. One of our most prominent public men went to Carlsbad last summer on general principles—that is to say, because the waters of Carlsbad were of high repute; but as they were not those required by his case, but were, on the contrary, precisely those which he should have avoided, he was made worse and not better by his visit. Dr. London points out with detail the cases that should be treated at this famous spring; for the contra-indications, the cases that are unfitted for Carlsbad, the excellent treatise of Dr. Kraus may be read ('Carlsbad and its Natural Healing Agents,' London. 1880). Both of these manuals belong to a serviceable class of monographs.

Beaumarchais. Eine Biographie von Anton Bettelheim. Frankfurt-am-Main: Rütten & Loening; New York: Christern.

It may be doubted whether Beaumarchais would have been satisfied with his latest biographers. He, who took such pains to color various questionable acts of his career in a way that has made it difficult if not impossible for us to say with precision just where he ceases to be veracious, would certainly not thank Herr Anton Bettelheim for the pains he has taken to sift out the truth in his large octavo volume. Louis de Loménie's 'Beaumarchais, Sa vie et son temps,' was, until the publication of the present work, the most available source for many points connected with the life of Beaumarchais. It still retains its high value as an authority on the literary and social history of the last quarter of the eighteenth century; but as what might be called the picturesque side of Beaumarchais's career was deliberately and avowedly omitted or attenuated by De

Loménie, his biography, in spite of its permanent merits, is necessarily incomplete.

Herr Bettelheim pays an eloquent tribute of homage to his predecessor, whose work he says "can be replaced by no other." His aim, however, is quite different. He has tried to do more, making use of more abundant material, and the reader is tempted to apply to his own book many of the pretty things he says of De Loménie's, which he calls a "rundes Kunstwerk," and a "Zierde der neuern französischen Gelehrten-Literatur." The new documents to which he has had access have enabled him to follow, with greater precision the literary adventurer in Spain and Germany, and he has been further aided by the searching book of Alfred von Arneth on Beaumarchais's adventure in Vienna. The result of all this is a life, of which the creator of *Figaro* might have said unjustly, as he did of Goethe's "Clavigo," "the German has spoiled the anecdote of my memoirs by overcharging it." But *Figaro*'s life, though it might be attractive if related by himself, could not be made exemplary if honestly told by another. Those who desire the romance and the wit of Beaumarchais's existence will still find it in the 'Mémoires'; those who desire a calm, well-written, and critical biography of one of the brightest as well as most unprincipled of literary money-makers and money-lovers, will find that in Herr Bettelheim's book.

Racing and Steeple Chasing. Racing, by the Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire and Mr. W. G. Craven, with a contribution by the Hon. F. Lawley; Steeple Chasing, by Arthur Coventry and Alfred E. T. Watson. [Badminton Library.] 8vo, pp. 419. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

THE subject of this book deserves a better discussion than it has received at the hands of the distinguished sportsmen whose names appear on its title-page. Were it only for the reason that horse-racing has long been one of the most highly developed of the arts of play which have been cultivated by Anglo-Saxons, it would be worthy of careful study; but it has a greater interest from the fact that the race-horse is, of all our domesticated animals, the one which has been most carefully bred and the most determinedly urged to the exercise of its peculiar power. The authors have seen fit to limit their treatment of the subject to the plane of ordinary sporting interests. Measured by this low standard, the work is only fairly well done.

The first chapter is devoted to the history of horse-racing; it really concerns the racing of horses in Great Britain alone, and cannot properly be called a history of the sport, which has had a large place in other countries. We next have a brief account of the Jockey Club, and then of racing officials, with a synopsis of the duties of the men who control the management of the sport. After this the book becomes a collection of fragments covering the different racing meets, the habits of jockeys, the breeding of horses, betting, and other incidental matters connected with the turf. We look in vain for any intelligent discussion of the principles of breeding. Only eight trifling pages are given to the subject, which could well have been made the longest and most attractive chapter in the volume; more than twice the space is allotted to personal anecdotes of jockeys. The text of these chapters is plentifully interlarded with Latin and French quotations, and the chapter on betting has a motto from 'Prometheus Unbound' in the original Greek. As usual, this display of classic lore is accompanied by much turgid English. We doubt whether the sporting reader will be most puzzled by the foreign quotations or the

involutions of his own speech. He will certainly miss the delightfully simple and forcible language to which he is accustomed in his daily walk of life.

The last hundred pages of the book treat of steeple chasing. The authors of these chapters, Messrs. Coventry and Watson, have given a simple and tolerably direct narrative account of this interesting form of racing. It is to be regretted that the whole book is not their work.

The Bridle Bits: A Treatise on Practical Horsemanship by Col.-J. C. Battersby, late of the First New York (Lincoln) Cavalry, etc. O. Judd & Co. 1886.

DESPITE a bad literary style and a fancy for "splurge" in writing which is indicated even in the title-page, the author of this treatise has given us a really useful and readable book. He is evidently a skilled horseman, for, unlike many of the recent writers on the art, he has discerned the fact that the bit is the most important part of the horse's gear, and that its proper construction and management are the most difficult points which the rider has to study. The bit is not the only, nor should it be the chief means of conveying to the horse the knowledge of the master's will: that task should in the main be done by the voice, or, in the ridden animal, by the movement of the rider's body; yet it is by the bit that we secure the control of the creature in moments of excitement, and convey to him our meaning in the speediest way.

To do its work effectively the bit needs to be a rather cruel instrument; it is applied to an extremely sensitive part of the horse's body, and acts in a way that makes it easy, on a well-constituted horse, to inflict great pain. There can be no doubt that as commonly used it is more an instrument of torture than either whip or spur. The author of this little book sees these points clearly, and gives the reader information which will help him to be merciful as well as skilful in the selection and use of bits. If novices in horsemanship would heed his recommendation of the double or "Bridoon-Bit," they would escape a certain class of accidents arising from the breaking of the single-bitted bridle.

It seems to be the peculiar privilege of writers on matters concerning the horse to make wide digressions from their direct way. Col. Battersby's wanderings are numerous, but generally amusing enough to compensate the reader for the lengthened journey.

Simon de Montfort, Comte de Leicester: Sa vie (1207-1265), son rôle politique en France et en Angleterre. Par Charles Bémont. Paris: Alphonse Picard. 8vo, pp. 387.

THE excellent lives of Simon de Montfort by Pauli and Prothero have, after all, only prepared the way for a complete study of the career of this the most eminent of the English statesmen of the Middle Ages. The work has now been taken up by a French scholar, who, building upon the foundation laid by his German and English predecessors, has made an exhaustive study of the authorities, and presented a view which is not perhaps final, but which must be accepted as the ripe conclusions of conscientious labors, in the light of all attainable information.

M. Bémont has not merely given his readers the fruits of his laborious researches, but has placed in their hands the means of forming their own opinions by numerous references and citations on nearly every page; and by an appendix of 118 pages, containing *pièces justificatives*. And in order to make his account of De Montfort's statesmanship more intelligible, he has entered at great length into a description of the social and political institutions of England in the

thirteenth century, which will be found one of the most valuable parts of the work. These pages are no doubt designed especially for his French readers, as there is no period at which the institutions of France present any near analogy to those of England at this time, and French readers need, therefore, to have a great deal explained to them which we of English blood can take for granted. Nevertheless, even we can derive much instruction from these chapters. There are few, even careful students of the history of the English Constitution, who can form a clear and independent notion of its condition at any one epoch; and the sketch here given is the clearest and most graphic picture of society and government in the thirteenth century that we have ever seen. Not that it contains, perhaps, anything that one may not find in Stubbs's 'Constitutional History'; but there is a power of grouping and of presentation, and a genuine French lucidity, which places this treatment even above that of Bishop Stubbs in these respects. In this respect chapter iv, which treats of the political constitution, is better than chapter iii, which describes the social condition of England. Probably the defect is in the state of our knowledge on the subject; but in the description of feudal society in chapter iii we find it hard to obtain a clear notion of the relation of the parts to one another and to the whole, such as chapter iv gives us in admirable perfection for the political institutions.

M. Bémont is even less disposed than Mr. Prothero to exaggerate the share of Simon de Montfort in the development of the English Constitution. His language upon this subject (p. 230) deserves to be carefully studied. The representation of the burgher class in the famous Parliament of 1265 was not, he says,

"borrowed from abroad by Simon de Montfort. He did not transfer to England the customs of Aragon [Pauli's hypothesis], nor of Sicily [Milman's], nor even those of Gascony [Webster's]. Neither was it an invention of his genius. As we have already seen, in 1213 the representatives of the middle classes (*roturiers*) of the cities, in 1254 and 1264 those of the nobles of the counties, had been especially summoned before the King, in the same forms in which they were regularly summoned to the courts of the hundreds, the monthly courts of the sheriff, or the assizes held by the itinerant justices. They came to exercise, in the presence of the sovereign, functions analogous to those which they exercised in the county in the presence of the sheriff. It was, as it were, a national grand jury of inquest which was thus organized under the most solemn circumstances."

So far, if we understand rightly, his view is precisely that of Bishop Stubbs, but expressed with superior breadth and clearness. He continues:

"The complete Parliament of 1265 is not, therefore, a creation. Neither is it a regular institution which Simon de Montfort planned to establish. The treaty between the King and the barons, which the Parliament has just ratified with unaccustomed ceremony, puts in operation the oligarchical constitution of 1264, which has as a basis the aristocratic constitution of 1258. It has no other bearing. After the 14th February the representatives of the commons return home, and there they will stay. They will not complain at being dismissed to that local life in which all their interests are centred, and where, from time immemorial, they are accustomed to administer their own affairs, because these assemblies brought them more burdens than advantages. Simon has so little thought of making the commons a regular element of Parliament, the assembly of 1265 is so completely, in his eyes, an extraordinary meeting, that in the month of June following, when he convokes the Parliament to an ordinary session, we hear nothing more said of the representatives of the commons: the greater barons and the prelates alone take part in it. In order that the commons may take a regular place in Parliament, it is necessary that royalty should find its advantage in it, that it should feel the necessity of associating the nation in a regular manner with the efforts of its foreign and domestic policy. This is what took place under Edward I., at the very moment when the French

monarchy, under Philip the Fair, underwent also this fruitful transformation."

We have given this passage at length, because it seems on the whole to exhibit most correctly the meaning and historical importance of this event. But we are inclined to think that, if most writers exaggerate this importance, M. Bémont somewhat underrates it. It is true that the representation of the commons did not now become a regular institution, and was perhaps not intended as such by De Montfort himself. This consideration helps us to understand what has been so puzzling in the ordinary view—the gap of thirty years after De Montfort's Parliament before the complete representation of the cities and boroughs reappears. But none the less it appears to us a "creation," or at least a creative idea, which entitles Simon de Montfort to a place among the founders of constitutions. The imperfect and probably forgotten precedent of 1213 may or may not have given him a hint; but to take a lesson from such a precedent, and summon a representation of the entire people of England, of every class, in what was really the establishment of an organic law, was an act of true statesmanlike genius. For the fact, which is pointed out, that the Parliament of 1265 was not an ordinary Parliament, but an extraordinary assembly, convoked for a special purpose, in reality enhances the importance of the act. We in America can compare it with one of our most original institutions, the Constitutional Convention. The Constitution of England, as remodelled by the discussions and negotiations of 1264, was to be accepted and confirmed; and in this acceptance and confirmation the whole nation was called together to give its consent.

The analogy pointed out with the French States-General, interesting and correct up to a certain point, is nevertheless misleading. Simon de Montfort's Parliament and that of Edward I. were—as is very well shown in this extract—built upon vigorous institutions of local self-government; in this respect, as in so many others, the national institutions of England were, to use Bishop Stubbs's felicitous expression, the "concentration" of local institutions. It was this that gave the English Parliament its life and its substantial power. But the States-General of France had no root, and they withered away. Both assemblies began at the same epoch, with essentially the same powers—hardly more in either country than that of granting supplies. Out of this the English Parliament developed its present imperial authority, while the French legislature, after some abortive efforts in the same direction, failed at last to maintain even its hold upon the purse-strings.

There is a good index and a tolerably good table of contents; but the book would be much improved by running titles and marginal index. On page 41 we find Alexander IV. of Scotland for Alexander III.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- A Race for Life and Other Stories. Cassell & Co. 15 cents.
 Cars, Duc des. *Mémoires de la Duchesse de Tourzel*. 2 vols. Scribner & Welford.
 Dumas, A. *Les Démonstelles de St. Cyr: A Comedy*. Edited by Victor Oger. Macmillan & Co. 40 cents.
 Edwards, H. S. *The Case of Reuben Malachi*. Rand, McNally & Co. 25 cents.
 Garlanda, F. *The Philosophy of Words*. A. Lovell & Co. \$1.50.
 Ginn, E. *Plutarch's Lives*. Classics for Children Series. Boston: Ginn & Co.
 Hellprin, L. *The Historical Reference Book*. 2d ed. D. Appleton & Co. \$3.
 Lee, Katherine. *Katherine Blythe: A Novel*. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
 Letters from Donegal in 1886. By a Lady "Felon." Edited by Col. Maurice. Macmillan & Co. 40 cents.
 Mason, L. W. *New Second Music Reader*. Boston: Ginn & Co. 48 cents.
 McClelland, Miss M. G. *Oblivion: A Novel*. Leisure Season Series, No. 1. Henry Holt & Co. 50 cents.
 My Night Adventure and Other Stories. Cassell & Co. 15 cents.
 Palgrave, F. T. *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language*. Macmillan & Co. 50 cents.
 Peyrebrune, Mme. G. de. *Une décadente*. Paris: Frin-zine; Boston: Schoenhof.